



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

~~Stop photo 115.~~

Per. 11126. c. 7.
1.



PRO ECCLESIA DEI.



hurch and tate
eview.

EDITED BY THE

VENERABLE ARCHDEACON DENISON.

VOLUME I.



LONDON:

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.

66, BROOK STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, W.

1862.

Index to Volume I.



AFRICA, the Church in, 316.
America: Church and State in America, 31. Civil War in America, 6, 169, 251. Lay Element in America, 178. Political Parties in America, 261. Recognition of the Confederate States, 312. The South Vindicated, 284.
Amusements, Popular, 217.
Annual Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 78.
Architectural Development, 122.
Asia, Eastern, 212.
Astronomy of the Ancients, the, 140, 189.
Auckland (Lord), Journal and Correspondence of, 42.
Austria and Hungary, 112.
BACON (Lord), 232.
Ballot, the, 61.
Baptismal Controversy, a Review of the, 277.
Bath and Wells (Bishop of) and Mr. Lingen, 167.
Biblical Psychology, 40.
Bicentenary, the: 83, the Bicentenary and the Wesleyan Conference, &c. 119.
Bigotry, 36.
Biography: Bacon (Lord), 232. Canning (Earl), 68. Disraeli (Right Hon. Benjamin), 159. Frederick the Great, 89. Garibaldi, 298. Irving (Edward), 90. Le Père Lacordaire, 285. Mackenzie (Bishop), 119. Macaulay (Lord), 233. Pitt (Right Hon. William), 39. Pugin (A. N. Welby), 237. Schleiermacher, 143. Wolff (Dr. Joseph), 16.
Bishop of Durham, the, and the late Archdeacon of Durham, 313.
Bishop of Natal, the, and the Word of God, 297.
Bishopric of Honolulu, 129.
Blockade, Mr. Cobden on, 303.
Body-snatchers, 86.
Brodie (Sir Benjamin), Psychological Inquiries, 96.
Brotherhoods, 175.
Browning (Elizabeth Barrett), Last Poems of, 44.
Bulwerism, 278.
CANADA, 164.
Canning (Earl), 68. His Administration of India, 157.
Carlyle (Thomas), History of Frederick II. of Prussia, 89.
Cathedral Music, 265.
Catholicity, National, 216.
Causes which produced the Low Religious Tone of the Eighteenth Century, 222.
Child-murder, 220.
Chorley's (H. F.) Thirty Years' Musical Recollections, 144.
Church: Bishop of Bath and Wells and Mr. Lingen, 167. Bishop Mackenzie, 119. Bishopric of Honolulu, 129. Bishop of Natal and the Word of God, 297. Bishop of Durham and the late Archdeacon of Durham, 313. Church-rate Division, 5. Church in Africa, 316. Church and State in America, 31. Church Congress at Oxford, 115. Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association, 131. Church Schools, the "Conscience Clause" and the Charity Commissioners, 211. Church Music, 265. Church and the Churches, 92. Church Schools, 211. Comprehension, 257. Convocation, 18. Convocation in Ireland, 37. Court of Final Ecclesiastical Appeal, 74. Crown Patronage, 313. Dilapidations, 81. Ecclesia Vindicata, 333. Increase of the Episcopate, 128. Judgment in the Court of Arches, 107. Judgment in Synod, 20. Lay Element in America, 178. Meeting at Wycombe, the, 299. Mozley's Review of the Baptismal Controversy, 277. National Catholicity, 216. Northern Convocation, 180. Perry's History of the Church of England, 231. Pews and Free Sitings, 176. Position of the Established Church in the Manufacturing Districts, 22. Practical Politics, 105. Primacy, the, 201. Review of Position, 1. Rise of the Latitudinarian School, 73. Royal Supremacy the True Defence of the Liberties of the Church, 29. Stuart (Mr.), 214. Suffragan Bishops, 180, 218. Way of Unity, 71, 171, 218. Whigs and the Church of England, 62. Zambesi Mission, 162.
Civil War in America, the, 6.
Clergy: Clergy Relief Bill, 8. Clergy Relief and Burial Bills, 65. Influence of the Clergy, 124. Our Want of Clergy, 68. Poverty of the Clergy, 33.
Clough (Arthur Hugh), Poems by, 240.
Cobden (Mr.), on Blockade, 303.
Coleridge (Mr.) and the "Liberals" of Exeter, 215.
Colliers, Life amongst the, 93.
Colonies: Canada, 164. England and her Colonies, 259. India, 165. Earl Canning's Administration of, 137.
Commercial Travellers, 223.
Committee of Council on Education and their Codes, 25.
Committee of the National Society, the, 118.
Comprehension, 275.
Concerning some of the Poisons of the Day and Night, 321.
Confederate States, Recognition of the, 312.
Conscience Clause, the, 252.
Constitutionalism in Prussia, 310.
Convocation: the Northern Convocation, 180. Convocation, 18. Convocation in Ireland, 37.
Correspondence of Napoleon I., 193.
Country Village Schools, 127.
Court of Final Ecclesiastical Appeal, 74.
Creation in Plan and in Progress, 191.
Cricket, 224.
Crown Patronage, 313.
Cumming (Dr.), The Millenial Rest, 46.
DEMOCRACY, the Ebb-tide of, 12.
Dickensism, 229.
Dilapidations, 81.
Disraeli (Right Hon. Benjamin), 159.
Distress in the North, 155.
Dogma, the New, 209.
Dollinger (Dr.), The Church and the Churches, 92.
Durham, the University of, 305.
Durham, Bishop of, and the late Archdeacon of, 313.
EASTERN ASIA, 212.
Ebb-tide of Democracy, the, 12.
Ecclesia Vindicata, 333.
Education: Bishop of Bath and Wells and Mr. Lingen, 167. Church Schools, 211. Committee of Council on Education and their Codes, 25. Committee of the National Society, 118. Country Village Schools, 127. Greek and Latin, 249. The Latest Discovery, 309. National Society and the Conscience Clause, 252. Rugby School and Balliol College, 17. The New Dogma, 209. The University of Durham, 305.
England and her Colonies, 259.
Episcopate, Increase of the, 128.
Estcourt (Right Hon. T. H. Sotheron), 64.
Exeter "Liberals" and Mr. Coleridge, 215.
Exhibition, the International of 1862, 26.
FINANCIAL Policy, Twenty Years of, 187.
Fine Arts: Annual Exhibition of the Royal Academy, 78. Architectural Development, 122.
"For Better for Worse," 85.
Foreign: Africa, the Church in, 316. America: Church and State in America, 31. Civil War in America, 6, 169, 251. Lay Element in America, 178. Political Parties in America, 261. Recognition of the Confederate States, 312. The South Vindicated, 284. Austria and Hungary, 112. Denmark: the Scandinavian Alliance, 205. Earl Russell and Prince Gortschakoff, 309. Eastern Asia, 212. France, Ten Years of Imperialism in, 239. Germany, the Unification of, 114. Greece, 301. Hawaii, 186. Honolulu, the Bishopric of, 129. Mexico, 66. Prussia, Constitutionalism in, 310. Venetian Diplomacy, 336. Zambesi Mission, 162.
France, Ten Years of Imperialism in, 239.
GARIBALDI, 298.
Germany, the Unification of, 114.
Gipsies, 79.
Gladstone's (Mr.) Theory of Moral Guilt, 307.
Greece, 301.
Greek and Latin, 249.
Great "Liberal" Party, the, 142.
Guizot (M.), Embassy to the Court of S. James, 185.
HARVEST-HOME, 207.
Hawaii, 186.
Henley Regatta, the, 129.
Hood (Thomas), 282.
Honolulu, the Bishopric of, 129.
Hymnology, 32.
INCREASE of the Episcopate, 128.
India: 165. Earl Canning's Administration of, 157.
Infidelity, on the Evidence for the Existence of, 24.
Influence of the Clergy, 124.
Innkeepers, 80.
Intellectual Moonshine, 268.
International Exhibition of 1862, the, 26.
Ireland, Convocation in, 37.
Irish Revivalism, 266.
JUDGMENT in the Court of Arches, the, 107.
Judgment in Synod, 20.
KINGLEYISM, 136.
Kirche und Kirchen, 235.
LATEST Discovery, the, 309.
Latitudinarian School, Rise of the, 73.
Lay Element in America, the, 178.
Le Père Lacordaire, 285.
Les Misérables, 286.
Lewis (Sir G. C.), the Astronomy of the Ancients, 140, 189.
"Liberal" Party, the Great, 142.
"Liberalism" as a Creed, 13.
Liberation Society (the) and the Privy Councillor, 263.
Life amongst the Colliers, 93.
Lingen (Mr.), and the Bishop of Bath and Wells, 167.
Lords, the House of, 202.
Lost Characters of English "Liberalism," the, 258.
MACAULAY (Lord), the Public Life of, 233.
Mackenzie (Bishop), 119.
Man, the Three-fold Nature of, 135.

Marriage Licences; Special and Ordinary, 25.
 Meddling, 126.
 Meeting at Wycombe, the, 299.
 Medical Lecturers and Theological Students, 271.
 Mendelssohn's Letters, 41.
 Mexico, 66.
 Missions: Bishop Mackenzie, 119. Bishopric of Honolulu, 129. The Church in Africa, 316. Hawaii, 186. The Zambesi Mission, 162.
 Mission-Houses: in Populous Places, 224. In Rural Districts, 77.
 Modern Credulity, 28.
 Modern Warfare, 70.
 Monastic Life, 94.
 Moral Guilt, Mr. Gladstone's Theory of, 307.
 Multitudes, the Use and Abuse of, 170.
 Murder, Child, 220.
 Music: Cathedral Music, 265. Hymnology, 32. Musical Development, 121. The Musical Season, 177. Thirty Years' of Musical Recollections, 144.
 Musical Development, 121.
 Musical Season, the, 177.
 Musical Recollections, by H. F. Chorley, 144.
 NAPOLEON I. (Correspondence of), 193.
 Natal, Bishop of, and the Word of God, 297.
 National Catholicity, 216.
 National Society: the, 59. The Committee of, 118.
 New Dogma, the, 209.
 Non-Intervention, 10.
 Northcote (Sir Stafford, M. P.), Twenty Years of Financial Policy, 187.
 Northern Convocation, the, 180.
 Novels, Tales, Romances, &c.:—Briscoe (Mrs.), A Woman's Life, 48. Bulwer (Sir E. L.), A Strange Story, 278; Collected Works, 278. Dickens (Charles), Sketches by Boz, 229; Dombey and Son, 229; Great Expectations, 229; Collected Works, 229. Hall (Mrs. S. C.), Can Wrong be Right? 48. Hugo (Victor), Les Misérables, 286. Kingsley (Professor Charles), Hypatia, 136; Two Years Ago, 136. Kingsley (Henry), Ravenshoe, 136. Scott (Lady), The Dream of a Life, 48. Stewart (Mrs.), The Valley of the Maude, 48. Thackeray (W. M.), Philip on his Way Through the World, 183; Pendenis, 183; Collected Works, 183; Wood (Mrs. Henry), The Channings, 48.
 OLIPHANT (Mrs.), Life of Edward Irving, 90.
 On the Evidence for the Existence of Infidelity, 24.
 Our Want of Clergy, 68.
 Oxford, the Church Congress at, 115.
 PARTY, the Use and Abuse of, 254.
 Patterson (R. H.), Essays in History and Art, 281.
 Perry (Rev. G.), History of the Church of England, 231.
 Pews and Free Seats, 176.
 Pitt (Right Hon. W.), Life of, by Earl Stanhope, 39.
 Poetry: Arthur Hugh Clough's Poems, 240. Elizabeth Barrett Browning's Last Poems, 44. Thomas Hood's Works, 282. Tupperism, 327.
 Poisons of the Day and Night, 321.
 Political Parties: 153. In America, 261. House of Lords, 202.
 Politics: The Ballot, 61. Canning (Earl), Administration of India, 157. The Church Rate Division, 5. The Clergy Relief Bill, 8. The Clergy Relief and Burial Bills, 65. Mr. Cobden on Blockade, 303. Mr. Coleridge and the "Liberals" of Exeter, 215. Disraeli (Right Hon. B.), 159. The Ebb-tide of Democracy, 12. Estcourt (Right Hon. S.), 64. Garibaldi, 298. The Great "Liberal" Party, 142. "Liberalism" as a Creed, 13. The lost Characters of English Liberalism, 258. Meeting at Wycombe, the, 299. Non-

intervention, 10. Political Parties—House of Lords, 202. Political Parties in America, 261. Political Parties, 153. Practical Politics, 105. The Privy Councillor and the Liberation Society, 263. Retrenchment, 4. Russell (Earl), 57. Russell (Earl) and Prince Gortschakoff, 309. The Scandinavian Alliance, 205. The Session of 1862, 109. Stewart (Mr.), 214. Twenty Years of Financial Policy, 187. The Use and Abuse of Party, 254. The Whigs and the Church of England, 62.
 Popular Amusements, 217.
 Populous Places, Mission-houses in, 224.
 Position of the Established Church in the Manufacturing Districts, 22.
 Poverty of the Clergy, the, 33.
 Practical Politics, 105.
 Practical Science, 319.
 Primacy, the, 201.
 Privy Councillor and the Liberation Society, the, 263.
 Prussia: Constitutionalism in, 310.
 Public Life of Lord Macaulay, the, 233.
 Pugin (A. N. Welby), Recollections of, 237.
 RAMSAY (Dean) on the Christian Life, 45.
 Reason v. Conscience: in the Literate or Scholar, 274. II. The Poet, 324.
 Recent Fiction, 48.
 Recent Scottish Synod, the, 256.
 Recognition of the Confederate States, 312.
 Regatta, the Henley, 129.
 Religion: Brotherhoods, 175. Causes which produced the Low Religious Tone of the Eighteenth Century, 222. Irish Revivalism, 266. Monastic Life, 94. Recent Scottish Synod, the, 256. Religious Statistics of Scotland, 225. Sisterhoods, 139, 314. Wesleyan Conference, Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Liberation Society, and the Bicentenary, 119.
 Religious Statistics of Scotland, 225.
 Relief of Distress in the North, 155.
 Respite and Reprieve, 323.
 Retrenchment, 4.
 Review of Position, 1.
 Review of the Baptismal Controversy, 277.
 Reviews: Arnold (Rev. F.), Public Life of Lord Macaulay, 233. Auckland (Lord), Journal and Correspondence, 42. Baschet (Armand), *La Diplomatie Vénétienne*, 336. Biblical Psychology, 40. Brodie (Sir B.), Psychological Inquiries, 96. Browning (Elizabeth Barrett), Last Poems, 44. Bulwerism, 278. Carlyle (Thomas), History of Frederick II. of Prussia, 89. Challis (Rev. J.), Creation in Plan and in Progress, 191. Chorley (Henry F.), Thirty Years' Musical Recollections, 144. Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association, 131. Clough (Arthur Hugh), Poems, 240. Correspondence of Napoleon I, 193. Cumming (Dr.), Millennial Rest, 46. Dickensism, 229. Dixon (W. Hepworth), Personal History of Lord Bacon, 232. Döllinger's Church and the Churches, 92. Kirche und Kirchen, 235. Ferrey (Benjamin), Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin, 237. Goodman (Margaret), Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy, 139. Guizot (M.), Embassy to the Court of St. James's, 185. Hood (Thomas), The Works of, edited by his Son, 282. Hopkins (Manley), Hawaii, 186. Hugo (Victor), *Les Misérables*, 286. Joyce (Rev. J. W.), *Ecclesia Vindicata*, 333. Kingsleyism, 136. Lewis (Sir G. C.), Astronomy of the Ancients, 140, 189. Life amongst the Colliers, 93. Lucas (Samuel), Secularia, 95. Mazzaroth, or the Constellations, 191. Mendelssohn's Letters, 41. Montalembert (Le Comte), Le Père Lacordaire, 285. The Monks of the West, 94. Mozley (Rev. J. B.), Review of the Baptismal Controversy, 277. Northcote (Sir Stafford), Twenty Years of Financial Policy, 187. Oliphant (Mrs.), Life of Edward Irving, 90. Patterson (R. H.), Essays in History and Art, 281. Perry (Rev. G.), History of the Church of England, 231. Present Position of the "Liberal" Party (by the author of Miriam

May and Crispin Ken), 142. Ramsey (Dean), On the Christian Life, 45. Recent Fiction, 48. Schleiermacher, 143. Sewell (Miss), Rome, Florence, and Turin, 88. Spedding (F.), Letters and Life of Lord Bacon, 232. Stanhope (Earl), Life of the Right Hon. William Pitt, 39. Ten Years of Imperialism in France, 239. Thackerayism, 183. Theories of the Propagation of Mankind, 330. The Threefold Nature of Man, 135. Tupperism, 327. Williams (the Hon. James), The South Vindicated, 284.
 Rise of the Latitudinarian School, the, 73.
 Royal Academy, Annual Exhibition of the, 78.
 Royal Supremacy, the True Defence of the Liberties of the Church, 29.
 Rugby School and Balliol College, 17.
 Russell (Earl), 57.
 Russell (Earl) and Prince Gortschakoff, 309.

SALADS, 173.
 Sanitary Science, 317.
 Scandinavian Alliance, the, 205.
 Schleiermacher, 143.
 Schools, Country Village, 127.
 Scotland, Religious Statistics of, 225.
 Scottish Communion Office, the, 35.
 Secularia, 95.
 Session of 1862, the, 109.
 Sewell (Miss), on Rome, Florence, and Turin, 88.
 Sisterhoods, 139, 314.
 Smoking, 174.
 Societies: Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association, 131. The Liberation Society and the Privy Councillor, 263. The National Society, 59. The Committee of the National Society, 118. The New Dogma of the National Society, 209. The National Society and the Conscience Clause, 52. The Wesleyan Conference Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Liberation Society, and the Bicentenary, 119.
 Sons of the Turf, 227.
 South Vindicated, the, 284.
 Sports: Cricket, 224. The Henley Regatta, 127. Popular Amusements, 217. Sons of the Turf, 227.
 Stanhope (Earl), Life of the Right Hon. William Pitt, 39.
 Statute-Fairs, 269.
 Stuart (Mr.), 214.
 Suffragan Bishops, 180, 218.
 Summary of Events, 87, 131, 182, 228, 276, 326.
 Synod, The Recent Scottish, 256.
 TEN Years of Imperialism in France, 239.
 Thackerayism, 183.
 Theological Students and Medical Lecturers, 271.
 Theories of the Propagation of Mankind—Traducianism and Creationism, 330.
 Thirty Years' Musical Recollections, 144.
 Threefold Nature of Man, the, 135.
 Travellers, Commercial, 223.
 Turf, Sons of the, 227.
 Twenty Years of Financial Policy, 187.

UNIFICATION of Germany, the, 114.
 Unity, the Way of, 71, 171, 218.
 University of Durham, the, 305.
 Use and Abuse of Multitudes, the, 170.
 Use and Abuse of Party, the, 254.

VENETIAN Diplomacy, 336.

WAR in America, the, 169, 251.
 Way of Unity, the, 71, 171, 218.
 Wesleyan Conference Methodists, the, the Congregationalists, the Liberation Society, and the Bicentenary, 119.
 Whigs, the, and the Church of England, 62.
 Windermere, 123.
 Wolff (Dr. Joseph), 16.
 Wycombe, the Meeting at, 299.

ZAMBESI Mission, the, 162.

Church and State Review.

No. 1, Vol. 1.

June 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

Review of Position.

IT is a faint heart which does not look cheerfully and hopefully upon the future of the National Church of England. It is, on the other hand, a poorly informed or self-complacent judgment which does not measure the depth and the amount of the accumulating responsibilities of her clergy and her people. It is a slothful or a self-indulgent life which does not act steadily upon the sense of what those responsibilities are. It is wilful blindness not to note the weaker points of the position, and especially the danger from within. For all danger to a Church is, in its origin and its power, from within. The fortunes of a falling Church are a continuous suicide. All warning and all experience, from the days of the Seven Churches of Asia till now, put this fact upon record. It makes no difference here whether a Church be national or not national: whether it be, that is, as the Church of England, recognized and established by the common and the statute law of the land as an integral part of the constitution, or whether it exist in a country as one religious body out of many, but with no peculiar and distinctive rights and privileges by custom and by law. There is no difference in respect of the source of danger. The thing which weakens or finally destroys is, in kind, the same in both cases. But there is a difference in degree: because, as the nationality of a Church is a gift superadded to its existence, and a very excellent gift, so the suicide in this case is the worse and the more thankless.

There is no present fear for the national position of the Church of England. There is no future fear, except under circumstances of intrinsic unworthiness which there is no ground to anticipate, and of changes in the framework and order of our social relations greater than it is easy to foresee. It is much to be able to say this, but it is not enough: it is after all only negative encouragement. To be able to take the position of the Church out of the category of things for which we fear is but a poor result and cannot satisfy the conditions of the gift. The Church need not fear for its position, and yet may be standing still. But what is required is that it do not stand still; that it advance continually in promoting the well-being of all sorts and conditions

of men. Now encouragement is not lacking even in this aspect of the case. Of all forms of Christianity, and of all ecclesiastical positions, the form and position of the National Church of England are those which may be looked to most reasonably and most hopefully to do the work which every Church has in charge to do. This is not an assumption; it rests upon facts; not only upon the facts of her primitive faith and apostolic order, but upon those also of her actual religious life; not only upon her amity and close conjunction with the State, but upon her earnest endeavour to discharge her office and execute her trust as the Church of all English people. The Church, that is, clergy and people, are beginning to rise more and more to the special exigencies of the position. There is the building and the restoring of churches within the last thirty years, a thing of perhaps unexampled extent; the clearing away of the square pews, and, both by arrangement of space and multiplication of services, the caring for the free and frequent worship of the people. There are many things, part of that worship, which tell of a truer and larger perception of privileges and duties. There is the building and the maintaining of schools with liberal assistance from the State. There is the more clerical life of the clergy, not as though many things in which they do not take part so much as heretofore are not lawful and innocent, but because their time and energies are not more than sufficient for their special work. There is the devotion of the lay life of men and women, and especially of women, to works of charity. There is the partial revival of the functions of the Church in Synod, attended with proof manifold that differences in theology and harshness of judgment between those who differ need not co-exist. And it is not only that men are not so divided as heretofore; they are acting in concert upon the basis of Church and State. Upon this basis we may all unite, but there is no other at once broad enough and sound enough. There is the drawing together and the better mutual understanding of clergy and laity. All these things are beginning to tell powerfully on our national condition.

But with all this there is no room for saying that the position is good; good as measured by what it ought to be and may be. There are many things still, some of them of long standing, which check and embarrass, in one degree or another, the development of the gifts and the power of the National Church; and, however unpalatable the ac-

knowledge may be, it must be confessed that these things are principally, if not entirely, to be found in, or to have arisen out of, its internal state. There is in some respects a lack of vitality, from faults of tending and culture, which hinders vigorous and healthy growth. And there are positive hindrances and not negative only; some of them in full operation; others less active now, but having left dark traces upon our religious and social life. Unfaithfulness to the doctrine and the discipline of a Church will be found, perhaps, at all times, in one degree or another, among the members of that Church, but it is not every time that produces this unfaithfulness in its most revolting aspect; that is, when exhibited in the persons of men who have come under the most solemn voluntary obligations to be faithful, and who retain the emoluments and the positions of a Church which they do all in their power to discredit and overthrow. Of this we have had of late a most unhappy instance, one charged with great and insidious danger, in the publication of *Essays and Reviews*. And there are worse signs of our internal condition than the publication of the book, even under the aggravated circumstances just noted. It is bad to have such a book at all. It is worse to see it eagerly bought up and read, and either palliated or feebly and faintly condemned. It is bad to have authors of such a book in charge of the education of the youth of the Church. It is worse to see parents and guardians still content to entrust their children to their keeping.

Again, it is not every time that sees proposals to destroy at the call not only of an unproved, but of a disproved necessity, a necessity not many years old, and born upon the hustings of the great towns in the excitement of 1831-2, a portion of the Church's inheritance; one identified with its national position: of this we have had not one, but many instances in Bills for abolition of Church-rate. Other bills there are, the offspring of abolition, which alike destroy the principle but keep the name. This is the way in which not a few Churchmen have met the abolitionist. A proposal to kill is met by counter proposals to kill, invigorate, and cure all at once; and, what is more wonderful still, by the same process. Almost every man has his nostrum for "the settlement of Church-rate." The first ingredient in each nostrum is the admission of a grievance, which it has long been contended has no existence, and which is now allowed to have no existence except as being a part of the great comprehensive grievance of the Established or National Church. Nevertheless the proposals go on. Individual and collective wisdom are continuously taxed to invent them. It is a sort of epidemic which we will hope will pass away with the finer weather of 1862. Now all these proposals, as addressed to those who would kill, and as inviting their concurrence and co-operation in the proposed killing, invigorating, and curative process, are comical enough; and, as addressed to those who are really minded to save, they lack cogency, as surrendering the entire principle of that which they would conserve, and slaying by slow poison and lingering death instead of by a blow. No Conservative who knows what he is about will vote for what is called, in parliamentary language, "Compromise of Church-rate." No man can do

at the same time two opposite things, maintain a building and pull out the foundations.

It is not every time that has witnessed the growth of jealousies and suspicions directed against the clergy, arising principally out of a hasty and inconsiderate return by some of their number to portions of ritual and ceremonial which in themselves are good to revive, but which should always wait upon the revival of doctrine, and not be made to forestall it; and to other portions which are in themselves indifferent, and from one cause or another affronting to popular feeling. It is not every time which has seen some considerable number of clergy and laity evidencing their want of faith in the position of the Church of England by a desertion of it for the Roman obedience.

There is a revival, too, of that which, if it could succeed, could only issue in the disruption of the Church. It will not succeed; but it is an evil that the question should be stirred at all, and a hindrance and offence. At no time, indeed, since the Reformation has "Revision of the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church," been advocated at once so recklessly and so feebly. But it is no testimony to the depth and calmness of the judgment of our time that men should think it possible to persuade the public mind that the changes they seek would have no effect but to relieve conscience. They would aggrieve conscience very far more than relieve it, as every one knows who knows anything of the matter. There is no grievance here, any more than there is in Church-rate, or in the case of clergy whom it is proposed to "relieve" of their orders.

There are other internal hindrances and offences of longer date; some of them in process of partial removal; of others of them the remedies do not yet appear. Among them the chief blot is the abandonment, as it were by general consent of the members of the Church, of spiritual discipline by way of formal censure of notorious offenders; and this notwithstanding that the civil power, while modifying in some respects the exercise of the ancient jurisdiction of the courts spiritual, has taken express care to guard and provide, by acts of parliament of this century, for the substance of that jurisdiction. There is no greater cause of inherent weakness than that which is found in this dereliction of the office and duty of the Church; none which is a more just ground of scandal and reproach, none which supplies a more striking instance of the facility and complacency with which those who are themselves in fault lay the blame anywhere but on themselves. It has somehow or other come to be assumed as an historical fact, and as such is often deplored by Churchmen, that it is the legislature which is to blame for the unhappy condition of the Church of England in this particular. Now the fault is not with the legislature at all, but with the people, the clergy, and, most of all, with the ordinaries of the Church; and that man, whether clergyman or churchwarden, would do the greatest service to the National Church, because he would assist very powerfully towards the relief of it from a great scandal and reproach, who should present to the ordinary, sitting in his visitation court, a case of notorious

offence against the morality of the Gospel, existing within his parish, and which he is prepared to prove, and, upon the refusal or the neglect of the spiritual judge to deal with such case so brought under his cognizance, should proceed to compel him, by way of "mandamus," to do his duty. The abeyance and present discouragement of the other manner of spiritual discipline, that by judgment in Synod of heretical books, will be dealt with elsewhere.

The argument might be extended farther. It might be shown in detail that, even in cases of actual legislation unfavourable to the well-being and efficiency of the Church, the primary cause of such legislation has not been so much hostility *ab extrâ* as some failure of the Church in respect of this or that portion of her mission and her office. This might be shown from the history of the abolition of Irish Bishoprics, the appropriation of the property of Cathedrals, and the Divorce Act. It might be shown from other failures and losses in which legislation has had no part: e.g. from those connected with the mismanagement of the Wesleyan revival in the last century. But it is not necessary to pursue the matter, and certainly is not a grateful task. There is a great awakening to responsibilities, a deepening sense of shortcomings and of opportunities lost: if Churchmen will only grasp and hold fast the principle that the Church cannot suffer, except by Churchmen's fault; if they will make profit of the opportunities now presented to their hands by the political and social circumstances of the time, all will be more than well.

One happy result at least would be that, in looking principally to ourselves for the causes of failure and distress, we should be less given to make complaints of the action of the civil power. In truth, it is unwise, if it be possible, to separate into its component parts the complex notion of Church and State in such sort as to assign to each its precise share in any given act of public policy. And, indeed, when it is spoken of as two things instead of as one thing compounded of both, this indicates a tendency to fall into the great mistake of viewing the Church as composed of the clergy only, and not of the clergy and the people. There are doubtless some things in respect of which there is a quicker jealousy of the direct action of the civil power; for example, the appointment of Bishops by the Crown; and some Churchmen wish to see this appointment otherwise ordered. In this we cannot agree. A Churchman's business is, surely, not to call for organic changes in Church and State, but so to assist, according to his gifts and opportunities, in doing the Church's work for all men's good, that it will be scarcely possible to make bad appointments. It is another question, and one which need not be touched in this place, whether any other manner of appointment would not be full of extreme difficulties, and be of dangerous consequence to the peace of the Church.

Some Churchmen, again, want to see the line between Church members and Nonconformists more defined than it is now. In this, again, we cannot agree. On the contrary, it seems abundantly plain that nothing could be devised more harmful to the Church, and more destructive of her national character: and certainly, in the absence of spiritual

discipline amongst ourselves, the Churchman cannot pretend to cast out the Nonconformist by act of parliament. There is surely a grave inconsistency in taking no account of the life of the professing Churchman, however bad it may be, and seeking to exclude the Nonconformist—against whom it may be that all that has to be said is that he is a Nonconformist—from so much of Church membership as has belonged to him, and which he desires to retain. It were better than this to return to the old days of civil disabilities and penal laws; for there was then at least something like equal dealing, because there was such a thing as Church penance too. Those days cannot return. It is not to be desired, under any circumstances, that they should; no, not even with the revival of spiritual discipline within the Church. But it looks like a lingering desire to see them return to attempt to supplement the Church's failure by statute law. The Church of England can have no more to do with civil disabilities, much less with penal laws. Within her own pale she must needs guard her children against teachers who hold her endowments but deny her teaching. This is essential to the life of every religious body. Without her pale she accepts "religious liberty" in its true meaning of the recognized freedom of the Nonconformist from all manner of coercion, and the admission on her own part not only of the fact that it is impossible, but also of the principle that, if it were possible, it is not good to coerce.

On the other hand, it ought not to be possible that the principle of a Bill, such as Mr. Bouverie's Bill, which includes a clause making it compulsory on a Bishop to violate the law of the Church, should receive that amount of sanction which is implied in its being read a second time in the House of Commons, to whatever extent it may have been in contemplation to amend it in Select Committee. Sir Morton Peto's Bill for "extending the rights of parishioners in parish churchyards," doubtless with the ulterior view of "extending" them in parish churches also, is in one respect less objectionable, in that it is brought in by a Nonconformist, and not by a professing Churchman. But the question is not what the man is, or professes to be, who brings in a Bill, but what Parliament does with it. This Bill, too, has been referred to a Select Committee, but without the justification which is found in the other case. It includes a provision enabling a clergyman legally to dispense with obedience to the Rubric in a primary point.

What is not in the mind of the Church will not be heard in her voice. Harshness of language and imputations of insincerity in those who differ are no part of her preaching. That is never the purpose the best assured in itself, nor the steadiest in action, which is the loudest in complaint. To denounce Nonconformity and Roman Catholicism can answer no good purpose, and the Church herself is not free from blame in either case. But it is as much our duty to protest and to guard against a spurious Nonconformity and Roman Catholicism as it is against a spurious Churchmanship. Religious antagonism is one thing, political antagonism is another. It may not be easy in a country where there is a Church established by law to keep the two

apart and distinct, but it should always be the aim on either side. The National Church may not concede equality instead of toleration. She cannot accept, in place of the religious nonconformity of many conflicting denominations, the merging of all religious differences in a general conspiracy against her national existence. She cannot accept comprehension of creeds instead of religious liberty. In so far as she does any one of these things deliberately she is unfaithful to her trust. In so far as she allows herself to be betrayed into them, or any one of them, she is not holding fast that she hath. To win the Nonconformist and the Roman Catholic is the truest praise. The Church may not despair of winning even the political Nonconformist and the Roman Catholic, because it is her mission. In proportion as she is faithful to her trust she will fulfil her mission. Assuredly there is such a thing as conversion to primitive faith and Apostolic order, and to the true principles of government in Church and State. The way to win is not so much to reason upon the defects of opposing systems as to carry out our own in truth and love. It is by the heart much more than by the understanding that we must learn to approach the gainsayer. Without the heart arguments to them are powerless; for ourselves they are not required; but rather, by fixing attention upon others, take off the edge of keen perception of our own deficiencies. Neither is it the true way of defence. The true way of defence is, having faith in the position as being not of human foundation, to lay out and extend our building on every side, and to watch anxiously and painfully lest any portion of it, as of a thing committed to our trust to keep and to enlarge in all its strength and beauty, be allowed to crumble under our hands. This is the Church's work; and the work will be done the more her clergy and her people press onward and upward through the ice and snow of worldliness and sloth, bearing on high the word written on her banner by no earthly hand—the word which tells at once of their calling, their answer, and their reward—*EXCELSIOR*.

Retrenchment.



THE common observation that a day which opens too brightly is generally overclouded before its close is one that must often occur to a Minister at the commencement of what is called a quiet Session of Parliament. Few Sessions have been so tranquil as the present, and there has seldom been a time when Ministers have had less of opposition to encounter; yet slowly and surely their position has been changing for the worse, and they are now visibly less strong than when Parliament met, while embarrassments are increasing and storms are brewing around them.

The symptoms of this change are various, but we shall at present content ourselves with noticing one of them. The most remarkable feature of the actual political situation is the attitude in which the two great parties that divide the country now stand to each other on the question of public economy, and of the necessity for Retrenchment. It

is the most pressing, if not the most important, question of the day; and it is the one upon the solution of which the balance of power in Parliament now mainly depends. A glance into the history of the past will show how the matter stands.

The hopeless confusion into which the Whig Administrations had brought the finances of the country before 1841, was one of the principal causes which led to Sir R. Peel's being called to power. Sir R. Peel's measures restored the proper balance between income and expenditure, and up to the time of the Russian war that balance was not seriously disturbed. The war led, of course, to an enormous increase in our armaments, and consequently in our expenditure, and to a considerable addition to our debt. As soon as it was over, the necessity of reducing our establishments became obvious, and statesmen of all parties agreed that they ought to be brought as rapidly as possible to a peace level. Upon this point all parties, we say, were agreed; but there was considerable difference of opinion between statesmen in office and statesmen out of office as to the extent to which the reduction should be carried, that is to say, as to what should be considered a peace level for the future. Lord Palmerston and his colleagues were for keeping the establishments up, while Lord Russell, Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Gladstone, being all out of office, were for cutting them down. It is probable that if nothing unexpected had occurred the views of the economical party would have prevailed. But just as the crisis of the struggle was approaching a series of events took place which materially disturbed the process of Retrenchment. Before the country was well out of the Russian war it had plunged into a war in China, and a war in Persia. Before these were concluded the great Indian mutiny broke out; and before the effects of that disaster had passed away a great war commenced upon the Continent, in which it was highly probable that England would have sooner or later to engage, and which, at all events, imposed upon her the necessity of arming in her own defence. The danger was happily averted; but though the country escaped an European war, it was compelled to undertake another contest in China. Lastly, upon the close of the Chinese war we have had to make provision against possible hostilities with America. Thus one event crowding upon another has prevented the accomplishment of the task to which at the conclusion of the Russian war we had been addressing ourselves, that of reducing our armaments to a proper peace establishment.

Meanwhile we have felt the consequences of this prolonged interruption of a necessary work in the disorder of our finances, the weight of our taxation, and, which perhaps is the most serious consideration of all, in the unhinging of our minds, and the formation of a habit of reckless expenditure of which it is very difficult to get rid. The cause of political changes has greatly tended to aggravate the evil. Lord Palmerston, the impersonation of the policy of expense, has upon the whole maintained an ascendancy over the mind of the country such as no minister has been able to exercise since the fall of Sir Robert Peel. Of his three chief opponents, he has absorbed two, Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone, into his ranks, and has made them the,

perhaps unwilling, instruments of a policy very different from that which they advocated in 1857. Mr. Disraeli indeed has, to some extent, maintained his independence, and when in office, in 1858, made an effort, not wholly unsuccessful, to reduce our expenditure to a moderate standard; but the weakness of the administration, unsupported by a majority in Parliament, and the disturbing circumstances of the European war of 1859, prevented his doing much to stay the tide. Since 1860 the financial measures of Mr. Gladstone have greatly stimulated the mischief by inducing the public to believe that they could at one and the same time bear a large expenditure and make large remissions of taxation.

At length we have come to a check, and the country is beginning to see, what in a short time it will see much more clearly, that Retrenchment is absolutely necessary, cannot be much longer delayed, and must not be trifled with. That this conviction would ultimately force itself on the public mind was certain. The time and mode in which it would be admitted, and the effects its recognition would produce were uncertain. It is a very happy circumstance that the Conservative statesmen have taken the initiative in dealing with it, for, had they left the question to be brought forward by the Radicals, it would have been put in a shape, and its discussion would have been attended with consequences, most injurious to the interests of the country. Between judicious measures of Retrenchment, adopted from conviction in the spirit of the Duke of Wellington's Government in 1829, and brought forward by a great party warmly attached to the institutions of England, and a hasty onslaught upon our establishments, conducted by men who would gladly make economy a plea for the destruction of much that we hold most dear, there is all the difference that exists between repair and demolition. The extreme Radicals have long had the will, but they have lacked the power, to do mischief. Had they been enabled to place themselves at the head of the Retrenchment movement, at the moment when that movement is about to become popular, they would have gained the power they have so long wanted. The Government, by their inconsistent and vacillating policy, had nearly made them masters of the situation. Mr. Gladstone in his Manchester speech had distinctly invited them to act. If we escape a great danger it will be because Mr. Disraeli had the acuteness to perceive the opportunity which was given to his party, and the courage to act upon his perception, even at the risk of a little momentary unpopularity. As a matter of party tactics the step was a most able one; but that is a very subordinate consideration. It is a step which, if boldly followed up, may prove most advantageous to the interests of the country. One only caution let us give. The path has been chosen, and they who have chosen it must walk in it without faltering. If when they have the power they hesitate to give effect to that which they now declare to be necessary, they cannot escape a day of heavy reckoning. The fortunes of the Conservative party for many a long year depend upon the use they now make of the opportunity which circumstances have afforded them.

Church-Rate Division.

ABOLITION is dead: self-exemption is dead. Self-exemption meant compromise, and compromise meant self-exemption, and so compromise is dead: nothing can be done but upon the responsibility of Government; so private bills are dead: a pretty good riddance of parliamentary rubbish for one night's work. It is wonderful how much nicer the place looks now that it has been cleaned up.

It is a pity that Mr. Estcourt, whose name is honourably associated with all this slaughter and purification, has not known where to stop. After so gallant a defence, a retreat within the walls would have been both glorious and wise. But this ardent recruit from the ranks of self-exemption could not so be content.

We remember a poor woman whose gratitude to the village doctor was not measured only by his kindness, which was great, but rather by the quantity and rapid succession of his prescriptions. "I do believe, sir, he has given me all the physic as is in his shop." Upon this rule the Church of England should be very grateful to practitioners in town and country, young and old. For, certainly, there is no symptom even of the most trifling indisposition which is not attended to with the most solicitous kindness, and with every variety of treatment. They are at her bed three deep; some with knife and saw; some with plaister and blister; some with potion and pill. The poor woman died; the Church lives: but we suspect she would recover sooner if the doctors left the room, and gave her more air and less physic.

This is for those who desire to see the Church strong and well. There are others of the doctors who have an interest the other way, and can hardly be expected to take our advice.

If ever there was a contest thoroughly fought out and decided, it has been the contest on Church-rate. The very success of the assailants, for some sessions, in the Lower House of Parliament, was necessary to give to their ultimate defeat its peculiar significance, and to stamp the decision of the House with the character of finality. Never was the power of organization better displayed than in the campaigns of the Abolitionists. Backed by not a tenth part of the English people, but admirably drilled, and drawing to its support the Irish Roman Catholic members, this indefatigable minority for a time obtained an ascendancy in the House of Commons. It is one of the incidents of an establishment, and, in itself, a happy incident, that it is very difficult to move. But this tendency may be in excess. There is a lesson here which, we trust, Churchmen and lovers of the Constitution will never forget. Their apathy all but proved fatal to their cause. Even now they cannot be said to have put forth their full energies; and certainly they do not yet know their full strength. They have had to fight this battle as if with one of their hands tied: their remissness lost them all the waver-

ers, and many of their natural allies. They made a terrible mistake in allowing the enemy to push forward his approaches so long unresisted. They allowed the banner of the Church to lie so long furled that many thousands in the constituencies, and dozens of members of the House, naturally gave up their cause as lost—as one to which the Church herself was indifferent—and enrolled themselves, many of them reluctantly, in the ranks of the Abolitionists. The consequences have been serious and the traces will not easily be erased. The men who have so often voted against Church-rate cannot soon release themselves from the pledges which they have so often given upon the hustings, and acted upon in the House. We trust, then, that the guardians of the National Church will never again be found asleep at their posts. Never, henceforth, let them forget the wisdom of resolutely withstanding the beginnings of evil. They may rely upon it their adversaries will always find work for them, in one shape or other; and even upon this question of Church-rate, let them bear in mind that the least relapse of energy or vigilance on their part—the least paltering with the great principle of upholding the Establishment as the Church of the nation—cannot fail to be attended by consequences deplorable for the present generation, and fatally disastrous in the future. If we would save the citadel, we must defend the outworks.

In another point of view the Church-rate contest has furnished a lamentable example—perhaps the most remarkable of the many on record—of the readiness of the chiefs of the once great Whig party, so full of anxious care for the Church of England in 1688, to sacrifice alike their principles and their predilections for the sake of obtaining a momentary success; for the sake of gaining the support of a revolutionary faction, by the help of whose votes they might replace themselves in office. It was not until out of office, in 1859, that the Whig chiefs recorded their votes in favour of the abolition of Church-rate. Then, for the first time, they sold themselves on this question to the inexorable revolutionists who sit below the gangway. The Radicals saw their opportunity, and made the most of it. The Whig chiefs hungered for office, but Mr. Bright and his friends shrewdly refused to co-operate with them in driving out the Tories until they had exacted a goodly price for their aid. The price was paid—again and again the Whig chiefs have had to follow Mr. Bright into the lobby; but the bargain now proves to have been a bad one. There are political compacts not unlike those said to have been made by the sorcerers of the dark ages, who sold themselves to the evil one for the sake of obtaining powers greater than belonged to them, but which compacts, however shrewdly made, always proved fatal in the end. The Whig Ministers may repent of this monstrous treason to the Church, but they will be held to their bargain. The factitious power which they so shamelessly bought can no longer save them; their momentary success has been swept away before that mightiest of political forces—the rising tide of public opinion, and, by what is mightier still, the force of truth. The time is near at hand when this betrayal of Church and State will be regarded

in its true light by the great mass of the English people.

Mr. Bright—but “surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird”—wants what he is pleased to call a “compromise.” Of what? Of English freedom. Of the right of English parishes to tax themselves. Of the right of the parochial authorities to take measures for the maintenance of the parish churches. It is a blow aimed at that best and oldest basis of English liberty—the right of local self-government. And what purpose would a compromise serve? If a compromise were either admissible or possible in this case, which indeed it is not, what would it do? Would it satisfy the enemies of the Church? Would it be regarded as a final settlement by the party which has voted and clamoured for the abolition of Church-rate? Not at all. Compromises have been offered freely, and as scornfully rejected. Not on points of detail, but because compromise of any kind, we were told, was out of the question. Some Churchmen, straining liberality beyond what it could legitimately bear, and to the destruction of that which they proposed to save, were willing to provide exemption for all who professed to have conscientious scruples against paying the rate. But every proposal of concession was scouted. It was not a point of conscience, we were told, it was “a question of supremacy.” This settles the matter. The opponents of Church-rate have cut even the loose and shifting ground of “compromise” from beneath their own feet.

The House of Commons has not only rejected the Abolition Bill by a majority of one, in a House, including pairs, of 610 members, but has pledged itself against any such Bill by a majority of seventeen. It is a good position. Two things only can damage it. Slackening of exertion out of Parliament; unwise and ill-concerted moves in Parliament. We trust that Mr. Estcourt may be persuaded to withdraw his resolution. He has redeemed his pledge. At this juncture any resolution is out of place. This particular resolution is open to the gravest objections. It is, moreover, so loosely worded that it is not easy to say of a good deal of it what it does mean, and what it does not mean.

The Civil War in America.

IF in Europe the political horizon is somewhat clouded, if one country is agitated by a revolution actually in progress, if a second is threatened with extensive revolt, while in others even well-meant and judicious reforms, by unsettling the minds of the people, are embarrassing their own rulers, and perplexing the anticipations of surrounding countries; these difficulties, great and sad as they are, fade into nothing when compared with the state of affairs across the Atlantic, where the most terrible evils that can afflict a people are exercising uncontrolled dominion.

It is now something more than twelve months since the great Republic of the United States was suddenly torn asunder by the renunciation on the

part of the Southern States of their allegiance to the Federal Government; and since the Northern States, disputing their right to make such a renunciation, undertook to compel its retraction at the sword's point. From that day to this the world has been held in amazement by the spectacle of the most gigantic civil war that has ever existed, with every feature of a corresponding vastness of proportion. Armies are levied on each side, of numbers which would have excited the envy of Napoleon in the plenitude of his power; sums are lavished in a single year such as never were at the command of Louvois or Pitt during the whole period of their administration; to crown all, new agents of warfare are brought into operation; and, while politicians are perplexed, and financiers bewildered at the complicated vastness of transactions to which they see no solution, military men in Europe are curiously watching one part of the war with a scientific interest, hoping to be able to test the value of the new discoveries in the art of destruction by the experience of those thus engaged in real warfare. Our business, however, as journalists, is rather with the origin, and still more with the probable results, of this great calamity. We cannot take our view of its origin from the parties themselves. From the first they both agreed in misrepresenting, perhaps it would be more fair to say in misapprehending it. Professing an utter indifference to public opinion in Europe, they nevertheless ostentatiously put forward, as the grounds of the quarrel, each that plea which seemed most likely to win favour with England and France. By the advocates of the Federals (to adopt the name by which the belligerents are now distinguished) the extinction of slavery was represented as involved in their success. The Confederates were held up as the champions of political liberty and independence, and of the inalienable right of freemen to choose their own government. As it seems to us, however, the quarrel arose rather from ethnological and social than from political causes; first and more remotely from the diversity of race; and more immediately from the difference of habits and feelings engendered by that diversity of race; and, in a greater degree still, by the dissimilarity of occupations, and of the sources of wealth which distinguish the Southern from the Northern provinces. The question of the origin of the disruption is not merely speculative; on the contrary, it has a direct practical bearing on the probable eventual termination of the strife; which is what we have next to consider; and this question, though second in order, is immeasurably first in importance. Happily for the means of forming a correct conclusion on this point we are not dependent on the information to be derived from the Federalists, who, in all that relates to the present progress of the war, have secured to themselves a complete monopoly of statement. Not that we imagine that their accounts are necessarily, or in any material degree, false; about the capture of New Orleans, or the evacuation of York Town and Norfolk, there can be no dispute, and it may be taken as unquestionable that hitherto the events of the campaign of 1862 have been even more favourable to the North than those of 1861 were to the South. But the contest is not of a nature to

be decided by the capture of any city or stronghold, however wealthy or important; nor by any single campaign, however full of great achievements. It would not be so, even were it waged within the comparatively narrow limits of an European kingdom; much less can it be so when, even if the battle-field as yet lies amid cultivated plantations, easily traversed districts, and opulent cities, it may presently be transferred (as each successive victory of the North has a tendency to transfer it) to the almost boundless expanse of provinces not yet wholly reclaimed, where every step will supply a fastness for the retreating Confederate, a barrier against the advancing conqueror. The Confederates claim to be fighting for independence and freedom; the way in which they are conducting the war, evacuating their towns so completely that, (as, for instance, at York Town,) not a human being is left behind, save one or two sullen or decrepit negro slaves; devastating their own lands, and burning their own stores, to the value of millions of English money, lest they should fall into the hands of their conquerors, shows that they believe in the claims they thus put forth. And if they do believe in it, all history proves that such a people cannot be conquered. The unprecedented and causeless ferocity, too, of the proclamation, which has placed the unresisting New Orleans under martial law, is only calculated to add stubbornness to their belief and to their resolution. We are aware that this doctrine is absolutely discredited in the North; we know that not only do Northern politicians and Northern newspapers vie with one another in unhesitating predictions of a speedy triumph, but that even grave ministers of religion, peaceful scholars devoted to the study of literature and science, express to their friends in England as undoubting a confidence in the success as in the justice of their cause. But those who speak thus seem to have forgotten the lessons which their own history as a nation might teach them. In the first years of the war which established their own independence were not the British troops almost uniformly successful? Did they not take New York, and Philadelphia, and win the battles of Brooklyn and Brandywine? And did not these advantages prove not only delusions but snares, leading us on to disasters such as had never befallen British armies in any other quarter of the globe, and serving only to render our ultimate discomfiture more conspicuous? It may be added that, if the continuance of the war which they tended to protract was a calamity to us, it was such also to the Americans themselves, by engendering a feeling of stubborn enmity between the two countries, which an early recognition, on our part, of their independence would probably have prevented. Not that, in saying this, we mean to blame Lord North's Government for withholding that recognition. The revolt of our American provinces was the first instance of the kind recorded in history; and our ministers may be easily pardoned for failing at first to appreciate its true character, and for hesitating to surrender so great a portion of their sovereign's colonial dominions.

But the Federal statesmen in America cannot plead this excuse. They have not only the light

of our unsuccessful attempt to retain them in their allegiance to guide them; but they actually owe their own existence as an independent power to the successful assertion of the principle which, when put forth by the Confederates, rouses them to fury. We are aware that pure theoretical logic, when unsupported by practical proof, has but little weight with those who govern states; and, therefore, we will not say to the Government at Washington, "Because you had a right to discard your allegiance to us, you cannot deny the right of the Southern states to renounce your authority in the same manner;" but, bringing practical proof to our aid, we may fairly warn them, "The power and wealth and population and resources of every sort which Great Britain possessed in 1775 exceeded those of your forefathers, immeasurably more than the advantages of those kinds which belong to you surpass those of your seceding states now. And, if we failed in coercing you then, it will be found equally impossible to you to coerce them now." May we not go one step further and say, "Supposing, against all probability and all precedent, that you should succeed, what will you gain by your success? Supposing that you suppress the revolt, shall you also extinguish the spirit of revolt; change the whole character of the people of the South, and extinguish the differences of customs and habits and feelings, which have led to that revolt? All this you must do before you can make them once more friendly and cordial towards you. And if you fail to do this, or disown the idea of doing this, by what means do you propose to retain them in subjection or in union, if you prefer the term? (which some of you do not.) If in subjection how many thousand bayonets will be required to keep down eight millions of conquered subjects? If in union, what kind of an union can that be, one member of which is not only recalcitrant by nature, but sore from the feeling that it is through defeat and compulsion alone that it is reduced to form a part of that union?"

We, therefore, look on a restoration of the union between the contending parties in America as impossible; and we earnestly desire to see the North acknowledge this fact, and acknowledge it soon. It is indispensable to their own welfare not less than to the welfare of the South that they should do so. Not only because the war between them is being conducted at a cost that, long continued, must ruin both; but because the early restoration of cordiality is essential to both. As we have already said, Great Britain and the United States both suffered greatly from the sullen ill-will that, after the peace of 1782, long continued to animate the two nations against one another. But the intervention of the Atlantic prevented that ill-will from having any practical development. Had we been conterminous states, we should probably have been at war half-a-dozen times in the next quarter of a century. The Northern and Southern states when separated will still be conterminous states, and being such, cannot be merely illwishers to one another. They must be friends or enemies. It is for the interest of the whole world, but most of all it is for their own interest that they should be friends.

We need say nothing about ourselves, and the part which we have taken, or rather the steady wis-

dom with which our Government has abstained from taking any part at all in the quarrel; and the dignified self-denial with which, in spite of the greatest inducements to a contrary course, the whole nation has approved of the conduct of its rulers in this matter. At present it pleases neither of the contending parties. We have no fear but that the day will come when its wisdom and its justice will be recognized by both. Yet the most rigid adherence to the great principle of non-intervention is not inconsistent with the tender of calm and friendly counsel. Mediation, we know, would be rejected, intervention would be resented, and, for the moment, advice will be scorned. Yet to offer it, and even to press and reiterate it may often be the duty of a sincere friend. And England has a greater right to give such advice than any other country, to a nation sprung from her loins, and, even in its present madness, only too faithfully copying her own example.

Such advice must of necessity be addressed to the North alone. To bid the South lay down its arms while the North is attacking it is to require an impossibility—to bid it do so when the North ceases to assail it would be superfluous. In the power of the North alone, then, is the choice of peace or war. And as an impartial friend, sincerely desirous of her prosperity and welfare, we would counsel her for her own sake to abandon a war in which success is not only hopeless, but, were it attainable, would be so pregnant with difficulties and dangers for the future, as to be a curse rather than a blessing. As the original parent of her and her antagonist, we would claim even to add some little of the authority of a parent to enforce that friendly advice; we would say to both, as Anchises said to his descendants, and most emphatically to him who boasted a descent from himself,—

*"Ne, pueri, ne tanta animis assuescite bella,
Neu patriæ validas in viscera vertite vires:
Projice tela manu, sanguis meus——"*

Clergy Relief Bill.



IT is very amiable, and in most cases very necessary, to mitigate the harshness with which the old laws imposed the principles which they embodied upon a dissentient minority, and, much as has been accomplished, much doubtless may still be rightly done; but it may be questioned whether changes, in themselves proper, have always been inspired by the most appropriate motives, and whether the present age, in its lack of earnestness, is not so falling into a habit of sentimental tenderness for the few as to blind itself to the higher rights, and to the true interests, of the many. It is at least certain that if a class, however small, can establish a superficial connection between the redress of their alleged grievance and the operation of some pet principle of the time, they will gain a loud support from the well-meaning sentiment of some and the popularity-seeking cowardice of more. In time they will probably carry their point, and as probably, in doing so, bring the principle, the help of which they have invoked, into collision with another and equally important one.

The two principles may have existed side by side for centuries, logically opposed, perhaps, but so instinctively avoiding all occasions of offence that they have worked together, with now and then a few jars, and now and then a little hardship to the individual, yet on the whole harmoniously and for the most real good to the State. But if they are ever thoughtlessly brought into serious conflict, no compromise can afterwards be re-established, and their relative strength can thenceforth alone define the limits of their respective action.

It cannot be said that Mr. Bouverie's Clergy Relief Bill has induced such a crisis as this in the relations between the principle of free thought, and that of a State Church, but it at any rate causes one of those petty jars which it is always better to avoid, and which in this case was hardly necessary. Neither principle ought to be lightly touched; and the propriety of Mr. Bouverie's measure depends on whether an injury has been done to the one so great as to justify the infliction of a shock upon the other; or, on what is practically the same thing, whether better moral effects would be produced upon the people at large by an altered law than by that which exists at present. A view of abstract right is taken by the Church, which is so far endorsed by the State that it would seem some grave injury must be established, or some high probability of improvement held forth, to excuse any such interference with the actual state of things. So long as the Church retains its character as an establishment, the State is bound to give effect to its principles, unless they distinctly militate against public policy; and one of the most fundamental of these principles is the indelibility of orders. There is the less reason for any change that it is a principle which is not acted upon offensively by the Church, and is supported in theory only by the State. No one imagines that a clergyman who abandoned his calling to engage in trade would be in any risk of persecution; no one supposes even that he would be debarred from any career which he might wish to attempt in the colonies. His disabilities extend no further than to an incapacity to practise at the English bar, or to sit in the English Parliament; and the argument, urged with contemptuous emphasis by some adherents of Mr. Bouverie, that the removal of these disabilities would in fact benefit very few clergymen indeed, might be used with equal force to show that, as the actual law gives rise to no practical injustice, it is at once needless and imprudent to incur any hazard by disturbing it. Nor would the hazard be at all imaginary. It is a very different thing to allow a principle to slumber, and to formally disavow it, even though its disavowal should be utterly inoperative. However common it may be to sneer at, or to talk disrespectfully of, the clergy individually, there is yet a vague feeling of reverence floating in the minds of every class, and certainly not referable in its entirety to high estimation of their intellect, education, and social position. Much more is it to be ascribed to the knowledge that they are a body set apart for holy purposes for ever; and it is hard to believe that much of this reverence would be preserved when it was understood that they might at any moment lay down their office as easily as a tradesman retires

from business. Society cannot afford to look upon its spiritual teachers with decreasing respect. It is a mere truism to say that facts or opinions have weight with the mass of mankind, not so much according to their intrinsic value as to the light in which their exponents are regarded; and, with reverence for the men, would also vanish reverence for their doctrine, even were that enforced with as much depth of feeling, and as much earnestness of utterance as is now employed; though this we should have no right to expect. For not only would a greater facility in throwing off the bonds of orders produce effects directly upon society, but yet more profoundly upon the minds of the clergy themselves.

It is alleged, and, it must be confessed with no little truth, that not a few of the clergy originally enter upon the sacred office with a very inadequate sense of the responsibilities which they undertake; and it is consequently inferred that these men can make but unwilling labourers, and that, if a road were open, they would depart, to the great advantage both of the Church and of themselves. With some inconsistency it is also argued that so strongly would public opinion declare itself against deserters, so terrible would be the social penalties with which they would be visited, that secession would then be nearly as rare as it is now. The latter assertion is more probably true than the former; but just as the general respect would diminish in proportion to the easiness, and not to the frequency, with which orders would be discarded, so the number who would in fact take advantage of their opportunity to secede would be no measure of the quantity of restlessness and of indisposition to honest work which would spring into being in the ranks of the priesthood. There can be no doubt, as we have already conceded, that many clergymen have adopted their calling for very frivolous reasons; but in a profession numbering so many members it is impossible, in the vast majority of cases, to secure more than an average intellect, and at the commencement a little more than common seriousness. The real question is into what this ordinary material is fashioned by the influence of solemn vows, and of a duty which cannot be shuffled off; and we are sure that the personal experience of most men, certainly of university men, will confirm the belief which we entertain, that an extraordinary proportion are sobered into contented gravity by the mere fact of being committed for ever to a certain course of life. But the effect upon those common men, those creatures of circumstance, of a liberty such as it is proposed to give them, must be essentially unhealthy. Their belief would not be altered, but their worldly desires would be quickened; their veneration for their own office would be gone, because it would be put on a par, in the eye of the world, with others over which they were wont to think that it had an advantage of prestige, which compensated for its monetary disadvantage; and they would linger on, plotting, yet never daring, to attempt some other life; lukewarm and heartless in their own duties, yet not bold enough to frankly take up another burden. This is the way that indifferent men behave in other professions, and in that one which has the deepest responsibility, and the

most that is disagreeable to the untrained mind, there is every reason to believe that the proportion of indifferent men would be the largest. Yet it is for these indifferent men, who require to be helped and guided into usefulness, that laws should be made; not for those sturdy thinkers and actors who will go their own way under whatever hindrances. But there is a third class to whose lamentable position the advocates of Clergy relief most frequently refer,—those, namely, who hold the doctrines of the Church of England in all essential matters, but who are sufficiently uncertain upon some minor points to be unable conscientiously to conduct her services. They are assumed to be very numerous; yet, if they feel so acutely as to be willing to brave the social penalties which would accompany their renunciation of orders, they must surely now prefer poverty or expatriation to a life of hypocrisy. The personal experience of every one may again be appealed to for proof of how small the number really is; nothing is more rare than to meet with a conscientious clergyman who refrains from exercising his profession. The more in fact that the proposed Bill is considered the more evident it becomes that its provisions would secure the benefit of a numerically insignificant, though perhaps a somewhat noisy, section of the clergy; and however real may be their troubles, however they may deserve sympathy as men, we must yet emphatically deny that they have any right, for their own peculiar advantage, to endanger the highest interest of their fellows and of the people. Let it be granted they have made a mistake in their vocation; but, as in the other lifelong engagement much misery, caused also by mistakes in early youth, has to be endured, because the sacredness of the marriage-tie is a matter of more importance to the world than the wretchedness of the comparatively few, so in this also must the individual be sacrificed to the general interests of society. Most, if not all, of the dogmas upon which the Church bases her relations with society, and of the rules with which she fences herself round, originally expressed the actual needs of the people as much as of the ecclesiastical order. Some have become antiquated and have passed away; some have become antiquated without disappearing: but some are as useful now as ever, and among them must be reckoned the indelibility of orders. Purely for its own sake society ought to insist upon the maintenance of the doctrine by the clergy as well as by the Church; and, indeed, opinion would probably declare itself in this direction if one part of the existing law could be got rid of. No one wishes to keep penal articles in the Statute Book which can never be acted upon, which no one would now wish to enforce, and which only serve to mislead the public mind. If these were swept away, there would be no occasion for further interference; and in all likelihood there would be little inclination except on the part of avowed enemies of the Church. Meantime from what has taken place in the House of Commons in connection with this Bill, as with Sir Morton Peto's Bill, one of two things is plain. Either a sound judgment upon such questions has yet to be created in the constituencies; or, from lack of organization, it has not sufficient influence with members.

Non-Intervention.



MORALITY in present times has happily extended itself into the domain of international politics. No European Power now dismisses an ambassador and marches its legions into a neighbour's territory in the brusque and high-handed fashion of Catherine of Russia or Napoleon the First. Victory is, and ever must be, on the side of the "big battalions;" but it is now seen that public opinion can raise battalions more numerous and enthusiastic than ever sprang up at the stamp of an imperial Cadmus. Unfortunately, wherever Morality enters, Hypocrisy follows. And although it is impossible not to acknowledge the great and beneficial change which has supervened in the foreign policy of all the European States, this change has been accompanied by an elaborate hypocrisy in the diplomacy of some leading Powers, which is not less dangerous to the European commonwealth, and is certainly more contemptible than the brusque appeals to the sword which Europe was accustomed to in former times. Now, more than ever, Ambition masks herself. If a colossal Power desires to annex some fair provinces of a weak neighbour, she sets her battalions in motion on the plea of establishing a "protectorate of Christianity" in the coveted region. If another Power, reviving the frequently baffled "traditions" of empire, seeks to extend her frontier, and aggrandize her power at the expense of her neighbours, she does so on the plea that she must draw the sword on behalf of "liberty and civilization." The very virtues of the age are made the handmaids of military ambition. And now more than ever, therefore, it becomes us to be on our guard against hypocrisies that veil themselves in the garb of virtues which we respect, and to scan well professions of principle, to see if they accord with the actual policy of those who profess them.

Our own country is of all others the most exempt from temptations to adopt such diplomatic hypocrisies; and we think we may say also, from the character of our people, the least prone to indulge in them. Yet the power of words is mighty everywhere; and not even the good sense of the British people is sufficient to prevent them being oftentimes led away by cant phrases of the day. We have seen how the cry for "Reform"—a word so justly attractive in itself, but made to cover so many projects of pernicious innovation—led both our Government and people to the very brink of a precipice, from which they have timeously recoiled, rather from beholding the sad experiences of other countries than from any unassisted sobering of the national judgment. Foreign politics have now supplanted domestic questions in public interest: and it behoves us to see that in this new field of national concern we are not befooled by phrases equally as in the other. Equally—or at least with equal danger to the State—we certainly are not; yet there are phrases and professions of policy current amongst us which are used in a sense which implies much

hypocrisy in some quarters and great ignorance in others.

Of all these cant phrases of the day there is not one which covers so much hypocrisy and misconception as that of "Non-intervention." We are congratulated that Non-intervention is now the established and recognized principle of European policy—that all the Powers acknowledge it, and that we ourselves show a noble example of practising it. Any one who looks at the actual position of affairs will see at once that there is a mistake of some kind here. With a French army in the capital of Italy, and a joint intervention of England, France, and Spain in Mexico, unsophisticated minds will naturally inquire, If this be Non-intervention, what is Intervention? Or if it be said—which is hardly true in the case of Mexico—that England at least takes no part in these high-handed interferences with the internal affairs of other States, the new question will arise, Does Non-intervention consist in allowing Intervention on the part of others? Lord Palmerston says that the continued occupation of Rome by the French is excusable, because it is sanctioned by the Pope, who, thanks to their aid, is still the Sovereign of Rome. But were not the Austrians in the Roman States by the same sanction?—and has not almost every case of intervention, however unjustifiable, been defensible on a similar plea? When the French army intervened to put down the revolution in Spain in 1823—or when the Russians intervened to crush the Hungarian revolt in 1849—was not the intervention in either case justifiable on the same plea which Lord Palmerston adduces in support of the intervention of the French at Rome? And when England, or any other Power, stands by and permits interventions to take place, the conduct of such a Power is not entitled to be called "non-intervention,"—it is simply neutrality; a neutrality which, so far from arising from noble or generous motives, may be purely selfish,—a dislike to incur the cost of opposing the wrong-doing of others.

The principle of "non-intervention," in its true sense, cannot be too highly extolled. In this sense it is the palladium of national liberty; it constitutes a bulwark behind which every State, however small, may regulate its domestic affairs without interference on the part of other Powers. This was the non-intervention of Pitt and Castlereagh. This was the principle maintained by the Tory Government in 1792, when, in the despatch of 29th December, they proposed that if France would abandon her conquests, and withdraw her armies within the limits of the French territory, the Powers of Europe "should engage to abandon all measures or views of hostility against France, or interference in her internal affairs, and to maintain a correspondence and intercourse of amity with the existing Powers in that country with whom the treaty might be concluded." This principle was never departed from by the British Government in its long contest with revolutionary and imperial France; and at the very close of the struggle, Castlereagh at Chatillon and Wellington at Bourdeaux steadily refused to countenance the claims of the Bourbon family, and adhered to the principle that the French people should be left to manage their domestic affairs as they pleased. In like manner, when the Continental Powers proposed to in-

tervene by force of arms to put down the revolutions in Naples and in Spain, Lord Castlereagh issued a circular in which he formally expressed his dissent, stating that such procedure "was diametrically opposed to the fundamental laws of Great Britain, and could not be admitted with any degree of safety as a principle of international law." And in regard to Spain he said, "As to the form of government which she has of late established for herself in Europe, that is a matter with which no foreign Power has the smallest right to interfere."

This is the doctrine of Non-intervention in its true form. But every Government which holds this principle must in certain cases go a step further. For, where one part of a heterogeneous empire breaks off from the other, establishes a Government, and shows that it can maintain its independence, then the very principle of recognizing every change effected in the internal government of a State requires that we should recognize this new Government as soon as it has shown itself strong enough to maintain its existence. This happened in the case of Greece, and also in the case of the South American republics, when they threw off the yoke respectively of the Porte and of Spain. And, in accordance with its principles, the Tory Government of England, led first by Castlereagh and afterwards by Canning, was the first to recognize the new States.

But of late years, under a succession of "liberal" ministries, the utmost confusion has been introduced into this branch of foreign politics. Lord Palmerston, as Foreign Minister, directly contravened the principle of Non-intervention by taking part in the civil wars both in Spain and in Portugal. This was done, indeed, in order to "secure the triumph of constitutional principles;" but most obviously, if England was justified in interfering on the one side, any despotic power was equally entitled to interfere on the other. So that, instead of the salutary rule of Non-intervention being adhered to by all parties, Intervention became a mere question of power, to be adopted whenever any interested State can do so with success. People who prate so much about "the principle of Non-intervention" at the present day should think of this: for the conduct of our own Government under liberal ministers has amply justified the caustic saying of Talleyrand, that "Non-intervention is a metaphysical expression meaning pretty much the same thing as Intervention." We cannot lay down one law for ourselves and a different one for other powers; and it is a sheer hypocrisy for us to appeal to the principle of Non-intervention in order to check the interference of other States, when we have shown that we ourselves don't care a fig for the principle when it suits our interests to ignore it.

In truth, the great talk at present made about Non-intervention is simply owing to the fact that this country is resolved not to go to war, and we seek to exalt into a virtue what is simply a consideration of prudence. What our fathers called neutrality we extol as Non-intervention. And yet, with all our unparalleled zeal for this cause, we permit other Powers, if they are strong ones, to intervene as they please, whether it be at Gaeta or Rome, or on the more distant plains of helpless Mexico. The economy of

such a policy is at least as obvious as its morality, and we suspect has more to do with it. But however this may be, it is ridiculous to see the importance attached to this cant phrase of the day, which, even as interpreted by the former policy of our Liberal Ministries means, as Talleyrand said, pretty much the same as its opposite,—which, as a statement of the present position, is false, and as a principle has become delusive,—yet which is dinned into the ears of the country as something very novel and fine by a “liberal” Government, which has neither a policy nor the power to enforce it, and which has sunk to that lowest state of impotence in which it can only give words instead of acts, and hope to be believed simply on account of much speaking.

The Ebb-tide of Democracy.

IT is an error of most generations to dream that their peculiarities will endure for ever, and that the old ebb and flow that has been wont to keep the balance of progression is to be brought to an end by them. But the temporary proclivities of society are only an aggregate of the vents of many little minds, whose egotism loves to take expression in an audacious assertion of finality. Here is the end, and we have achieved it! The truth being that there is no end; and that, if there were, its clamorous asserters would be but the passive creatures of its advent. The cycles of human politics are at least as old as the speculations of Plato, and every possible form of government, every possible phase of public opinion, shows in the day of its decay the first buds of that which shall succeed it. Aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy, despotism, are exhibited in relative priorities and an undeviating recurrence; but none of them are essentially primeval, and any one of them will be the final condition of a people by the accident alone of its duration. As a nation we are now passing through one of those periods which make the proofs of all this. The bent of our social course towards democracy had become so apparent since the year 1832, and the supposed affinity of this bent with the growth of science, of education, and of commerce, had become so generally taken for granted through the instigations of those who were mainly interested in preaching it, that right-feeling men began to accept, as a sort of baptism imposed by conquest, the self-sufficient political creed of the democratic party. No doubt the destiny of an elective franchise is to change its basis, by extension or contraction, according to the temper of the times. But the system of suffrage itself is but an intermediate link in the historic chain, one point in the political ecliptic; and the laws of its expansion and contraction are but secondary to that wider class of phenomena of which it does itself actually form one. The pretensions of sectional and ephemeral politicians are ridiculous enough to the more thoughtful and comprehensive student of history. They are as if the flies upon a wheel within a wheel should credit themselves with the appreciation and conduct of the revolutions of the

outer one; or the dwellers upon the banks of some bubbling rivulet, whose fall into a larger but still tributary stream they were unable to see, should boast over their neighbours that their own was not only the true branch river, but the very Amazon itself at the head of its straight and stately course into the main ocean. Let the self-consequent advocates of democracy in this country take the trouble to inquire into the claims which the great political system, of which their peculiar tenets are but a sectional manifestation, has to be called either final or universal. Let them settle how far any phase of it at all has been spontaneously exhibited elsewhere in the world, not in Europe merely, but in the other, and, politically speaking, the older continents. Let them see in how few places it has been indigenous, and in how many its acclimatization has been tried and failed. Let them, from the other point of view, trace its own native growth; let them study the laws of its progression; let them calculate from a point external to their own vanity and self-consciousness the true probabilities of its destiny. Let them conceive of it but for one moment as something which our race has produced, and something which our race may outlive. And having done all this, let them laugh at the silly and narrow notions that could regard a cyclical phase of a greater cyclical manifestation as the final order of something greater still. What place the parliamentary system of Great Britain may be found ages hence to have occupied in the great march of humanity is a matter as far beyond the scope of antecedent speculation as are the intermediate flux and reflux which will doubtless continue to be elements in its own history. The relative power of the Crown and the three Estates, as it has often altered hitherto, will often alter again, for the Nemesis of the preponderance of one is that it should beget that of another. These alternations have never been philosophically observed, and perhaps the existence of the system itself is hardly yet old enough to admit of a safe declaration of their sequence. But of this we may be sure, that the dominance of no one element is more final than that of either of the others; and that the Crown, the titular and landed aristocracies, the middle classes and the mass, have all had their turn of power, and in some succession or other, so long as the system lasts, will continue to have it.

In the meantime it must not be understood that these changes and oscillations of preponderance are either morally or socially matters of indifference. There is a wrong in every excess, and looked at in its consequences, a greater wrong in democratic excess than in any other. It is this last alone that connotes demolition, that destroys what it cannot renew. Inaction is the far less dangerous and less effective fault of its correlatives. They may, and doubtless do, every now and then cramp the increase of the State's well-being; much that is desirable in change and progression they are sluggish to initiate; but they invent no new form of evil. They maintain many a plant of tares among the wheat, but the main crop of good corn they cannot uproot. They may hold to the maintenance of existing abuse, but this is only through the jealous grasp of their retention upon the good. Provided that the overplus in the existing state of things be one of benefit and

purity, it is better that what has been endured should be endured still, in order that what has been enjoyed should be enjoyed the while.

But whatever may be the relative innocuousness between one form of excess and another, the existence of some normal and ascertainable adjustment of power, is the only condition upon which the usefulness of our mixed political system can be made a tenable hypothesis. An excess on the side either of aristocracy or democracy, if it be defended on its merits, is a virtual abnegation of that condition, and a repudiation of all that depends upon it. The only solution of the political creed of "the Revolution families," as they loved to call themselves, in the reign of George III, was an intermediate oligarchy, tending to an ultimate despotism, which, had they seen it looming in the distance, they would themselves have counted their own ruin. Similarly a republic has been the outlook of the more consistent and outspoken modern Radical. The ascendancy of the Whig party has always been more unchallenged than that of the Radicals simply because its meaning was masked by an aristocratic tendency before the Monarchical party, and by a liberal bearing towards the Radical. For the time at least the antique Monarchical faction exists no longer. What the ascent of some ambitious master-spirit on to the throne might do towards its reconstruction, it would hardly be safe to say. At present, however, out of the spirit which of old imbued the best and wisest of its members, and the best and wisest of those from whom the original Whig party sprang, there has grown up a new political idea,—Conservancy. It is towards this idea,—for strictly speaking, its expressors are not a party, being something better,—that the worthiest from all sections of political thinkers throughout the country, all those in fact who have not either formally or virtually given up the English system, have begun to gravitate. This movement is converting the epoch into a period of political arrest, of detection, of the repression of that excess, which being many-sided, is injurious from all points though permanently disastrous for the most part on one. From this convergence, this comparison and assimilation of convictions, this congression for the discovery of the true political mean, the oligarchist and the democrat alone stand aloof. Into it all constitutionalists, however divergent among themselves their peculiar proclivities or fears may have made them, must and do come. All such men alike are beginning to feel that the ancient State Edifice requires their combined attention. Some of them centre their consideration upon the ravages which it has suffered from time, others direct theirs to the accommodations that must be made in it to the changes of time; but all agree to the necessity of its preservation, and all have begun to recognize the fact that one section of the people who have grown up under its shelter is eager in sheer selfishness for the act of its demolition. Against this act there has been a combination of the best elements of the national character, and the result is the new manifestation of Conservatism. To call the exponents of this idea "a party" is to make use of a misnomer, until they are brought into a collision with that Democratic element of destruction which evoked them. It is true that for years past they have been called a

party, in a sense to be interpreted according to the interests of that faction whose business it has been to prevent accession to their ranks. It is also true that personal ambitions jealousies and attachments have done much to keep them circumscribed within the limits of a common political faction, and every now and then to thrust upon them the lower aims and acts of state craft as the price of their preservation. But personal ambitions, jealousies, and attachments are in their nature but transitory interpositions; and are barriers which must, as they are one by one removed, leave so many passages open for the free flow of opinion and sympathy towards their natural centre.

"Liberalism" as a Creed.



WE trust that many of our readers may be acquainted with that excellent passage in Lord Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, where he dwells upon the power of words to lord it over the human mind, and to do violence even to the better judgment which is conscious of the fallacy they involve. "The idols of the marketplace," which are generated by the vulgar and indiscriminating use of words, are not, he says, to be expelled from the intellect without wounding as they fly. Driven out by definition, they hit us with a Parthian shot, and leave a mark behind them which is never perhaps wholly to be obliterated. Many apt illustrations of this truth might be discovered in the political and religious vocabularies of the present day; nor has the necessity of rescuing the public mind from the usurped authority of a false nomenclature been wholly overlooked of late years. Considerable good has been effected by the restoration of the word "catholic" to its legitimate position in the Church. Efforts are being made to break through the illusions which encompass the word Whiggism in the State. We purpose in the present article to challenge another political phrase, which has been abused perhaps even more than the above; which either monopolizes for a particular party attributes which are common to all; or else conceals behind a name which all have been accustomed to honour as a synonym for what is noble and elevating, the most sordid and debasing principles. We mean the modern party-title of Liberalism.

It is difficult to estimate with exactness the injury which such abuses cause; so subtly and imperceptibly do they operate. Probably not one man in five who divides the political world into Conservatives and Liberals, counting himself among the latter, is, as a rule, conscious of believing that he considers all the former to be *il*-liberal. Yet, seeing that he applies the word liberal to himself as a distinctive epithet, the idea of its contradictory, that is, of "not liberal," must lie dormant in his mind somewhere. And thus a great mass of latent prejudice is left slumbering in the popular brain until circumstances call it into action. There it remains as the material of a good party cry whenever such assistance may be wanted; while, even in the meantime, all persons who avow themselves Conservatives are liable to feel the effects of this lurking fal-

lacy, in a vague, vaporous kind of odium, which, as it were, sprinkles them with blacks, like the atmosphere of a smoky town.

Not but what the word Liberal, as a party word, *does* imply the existence of a class of men, somewhere or other, whose views of things in general are not liberal. One might divide mankind at large into men of liberal and illiberal views by a line that should be cut pretty cleanly. But the question that we have to solve is this, whether it would be possible to identify that division with any of those other divisions which are known among men as religious, political, or social. That is to say, Can Liberalism be made the *differentia* of a creed? Can it be made applicable to what a man believes himself? And does it not rather indicate the mode in which he habitually regards the belief of other people? In order to answer these questions, we must endeavour to frame some conception of what real Liberalism is; and, though it would be needlessly pedantic to dwell upon the etymological meaning of the word, and its invariable significance among the Greeks and Romans, it may be advantageous to remind our readers that it never had *any other* meaning than this till about some thirty years ago. The Greek *ἐλευθέριος*, and the Latin *liber*, or *liberalis*, being only different forms of the same word, express the same idea which we express ourselves when we apply the term "liberal" to a profession. A liberal profession is that which a man is able to pursue without bringing down his mind from that level of contemplation where he sees humanity as a whole, and his own profession lying among others at his feet. It is a profession which leaves him free—*homo liber*. This, we say, is the fundamental *idea* of a liberal profession; that it is constantly departed from, abused, and misinterpreted is nothing to the purpose. An almost inseparable adjunct to this idea was that a liberal profession was not pursued for gain, but because it was honourable in itself. We see this truth curiously exemplified even now in the state of our liberal professions. Officers in the army were supposed to serve from feelings of honour. Their pay was a mere *honorarium*; otherwise it would never have been regulated on its present scale. The law knows nothing of a barrister's or physician's fees. They have no right of action if defrauded. Even the estates bestowed upon the Church were never given as a means of enriching individuals. Churchmen were supposed to have no worldly goods. It was the business of the faithful to provide them with the necessities of life. But it was never supposed, till very bad times indeed, that any man took Holy Orders simply to obtain a good income. But a man who engages in trade or commerce does it obviously for no other reason. And, being bent on making money for himself, that being the beginning and the end of all his prospects, his mental gaze is naturally more contracted than that of the soldier, the jurist, or the priest. These, at all events, if they look no higher, have their respective societies to consider, which demand of them a certain self-sacrifice. The army, the law, the Church, are to them so many great ideas with which nothing sordid can be associated. But the trader has nothing of this kind to elevate and enlarge his mind,

and draw it off from comparatively petty interests. This is the *theory* of the subject, held not only by the Greeks and Romans, but very generally among all modern nations down to the present day. Cicero was quite ready to admit as much as we admit about such professions as medicine, architecture, &c. They were not, he said, below the practice of a gentleman. Commerce, too, if conducted upon such a scale as to relieve it from the necessity of dishonesty, was not altogether to be censured. If undertaken with a view to subsequent retirement, and the enjoyment of cultivated leisure, it was worthy of the highest praise. We do not know that modern times have improved very much on these sentiments. We fancy they are generally entertained, if not invariably avowed, among the educated classes of this country. And they exactly embody as much as can be accurately expressed by the term "Liberalism."

A certain elevation of mind, then, enabling us to see our own opinions and those of other people alongside of each other and a certain generosity of sentiment, leading us habitually to subordinate material interests to moral and intellectual beauty, are the distinguishing characteristics of Liberalism. It is the result of various constituent elements. Birth, nature, education, profession, all combine in its formation. The man in whom they do so combine is almost sure to be a gentleman. He will be tolerant of his fellows in society; open to conviction in argument; willing to listen to new ideas; courteous in his demeanour to all men; probably a man of taste in art, literature, and science. But of what particular creed, either in politics or religion, he will be is a matter which we submit is not of the essence of the question. But we need hardly point out that adherence to first principles is a necessary ingredient of a mind of this order, and it is sure to become more firm and lasting as time goes on. For it is part of a liberal education to teach the necessity of theory: and one of the best tests of a truly liberal mind is the adaptation of theory to practice without injuring the former. And here we may remind our readers that when this word was first introduced into politics it was done with a full consciousness that it was not a proper name for a party. The word first came into vogue when Mr. Canning was trying to lead his party along that narrow path which proved their ruin under Peel and Wellington. He *was* a Liberal. He had been educated in that earlier school of Toryism of which Pitt was the great master; and had he lived, the concession of the Roman Catholic claims would not have been followed by a revolution. The concession of them by Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington so shattered the confidence of the Tory party in their only remaining leaders that it wholly unnerved them for fighting the battle of the Reform Bill. But Canning had always been in favour of the Romish claims. Their concession by him would have involved no breach of faith. And this it was which made the whole difference. Canning and his party were Tories as much as Peel and Wellington were Tories. The political creed of all three was the same. Government by the Crown and the three Estates of the realm in Parliament, to the exclusion of the uneducated and inevitably indigent populace,

was the common theory of all. The concession of the Romish claims did not infringe this theory in the slightest degree. With Peel and Wellington, however, the concession was compulsory, and proves nothing. But Canning had favoured it all his life. He had seen the propriety of it before the close of the eighteenth century. His mind had been flexible enough to understand that the Romish disabilities represented a worn-out state of things; and had they been removed then, it is highly probable that concession would not have disappointed us. Now the mind which can appreciate such truths as these by its own natural and spontaneous action is a liberal mind; and Canning and the Tories who adhered to him in 1829 chose to accept that designation not as the title of a new party, but merely to distinguish men of a certain mental organization in the old party. But the word was found to be so convenient: to express either so much or so little, as the case might be: to be so excellent a cloak for opinions of the most unpopular or the most superficial character; that it was speedily appropriated as a common denomination by the Whigs and their new Radical allies, who have continued to use it ever since as the differential title of a distinct political party for which it is utterly unsuitable.

The word, we repeat, is equally inappropriate whether applied to religion or to politics. Let us take the Church of Rome, for instance. Extravagant and unscriptural as some of her doctrines may be, there is nothing in them more "illiberal" than in many of the doctrines which all Christians accept. Nay, it is said, but the illiberalism consists in believing that there is no salvation for any one who denies these doctrines. But why is it more illiberal to say that there is no salvation for one who doubts about any given doctrine, than for one who doubts about any other given doctrine, when both are equally mysteries, and equally hard to human reason. Oh, but it is said the Church of Rome is a persecuting Church, and persecution is illiberal. But all religious bodies will persecute in a certain way, if they only possess the power. Is the Scotch Kirk not a persecuting Church? Was not Cromwell's little finger heavier than the loins of the Bishops? The argument will not stand. There are zealots in the Romish Church, as there are in all other churches, and zealots are usually illiberal. But their doctrine, their *creed*, is the same as that of their co-religionists. Liberalism and illiberalism make no difference in that.

Let us turn to politics. Is there anything illiberal in those principles of policy which are commonly described as Conservative? or in that theory of government which belongs distinctively to the Tories? Set the Conservative creed against any other creed which describes itself simply as "Liberal." Is there any necessary difference? Observe what Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell, keeping their Whiggism, which is something quite distinct, in abeyance, say on constitutional questions! Listen to Sir Cornwall Lewis, or to Mr. Gladstone! All these noblemen and gentlemen profess to speak the language of Liberals; to be distinguished from their opponents by their Liberalism. Yet, when they speak in this capacity, have they anything distinctive to say? Does Liberalism supply them

with a single formula or a single doctrine to which their opponents would object? No: not one. As Liberals merely they have no doctrines, nor even nostrums. And why? Because, we repeat again, Liberalism, in the nature of things, cannot constitute a creed. It is a frame of mind, not an article of faith.

Pursue this question to whatever length we may, the same conclusion will emerge. Carry the investigation through the professions, into social problems, wherever it is possible to find conflicting theories which furnish an appropriate test, and the same conviction will force itself upon us, that no one party can be found deserving the name of liberal or illiberal, on account of their peculiar tenets. If this, therefore, is the case, and we are thrown back after all upon the ancient signification of the word "Liberal," as the only one which makes it a practical line of demarcation between different descriptions of men, we may inquire, with considerable confidence, which deserve the title best, the Conservative party or their rivals? Among which party, as a rule, will be found those men who uphold the liberal arts and liberal education against the pressure of the *cui bono* philosophers? In which of the two parties will be found the most logic and the least empiricism; the greatest aptitude for taking broad views, and the least tendency towards selfish and sectarian ones? We apprehend that there cannot be a doubt on this point. But the other day we read a letter, in the columns of the *Times*, on the subject of the Lancashire distress. The letter was signed *Scrutator*. We are ignorant who *Scrutator* is. There was nothing whatever in his letter to betray his political opinions. Certainly there was no reason in the world to suppose he was a Conservative. Yet, what does he say? "The cotton manufacturers as a class are 'cute,' but few of them like broad views—in fact, their want of education forbids it." That is, for *Scrutator's* own language is a little loose, forbids their liking broad views. Yet, are not the cotton manufacturers the very thews and sinews of the so-called great Liberal party? The fact is that "murder will out" at last. The manufacturers of this country have, for the last twenty years, been the spoiled children of the age. In a period of exceptional prosperity their defects have been but little seen. Occasionally it has been hinted, by writers entitled to respect, that their Liberalism was not very conspicuous in their dealings with those whom they employed. But the protest has usually been drowned in the clamour of the vast majority, and the manufacturers have been puffed into believing themselves something like the salt of this island. Yet, now we find an evidently competent observer stating of them, as a class, that they don't like broad views—that "their want of education forbids it." But, in the name of common sense, how can any man be a true Liberal who is incapable of taking broad views, and whose education has been so defective as to make him dislike broad views? Yet such men, we repeat, are the recognized yeomen of "Liberalism."

If, therefore, we are to take the word "liberal" in its ancient and accurate sense, we say that the true Liberal party of England is the Conservative party: the party which upholds liberal culture, scientific

political principles, and takes an imperial and catholic view of the national interests. We object to the word as descriptive of a political party, because it implies no programme, and because it is impossible that there should not be many men in the opposite party equally well entitled to the designation. But still, if either party is to have it, it is clearly the property of the Conservatives.

On the other hand, we have to consider that Liberalism is frequently predicated of a distinct set of political principles whose true tendency it conceals. As far as that party which sits upon the Speaker's right is liberal, in the true sense of the term, it merely discovers an attribute which it shows in common with the Conservatives, and which constitutes, therefore, no clear line of separation. But as far as that appellation points to a set of principles which do form a line of demarcation, it is not really Liberal but Radical. Liberalism, if we waive all our previous arguments, and consent to receive it as a political creed of itself, means simply Democracy in the State and Deism in the Church: means the overthrow of everything which the greatest minds of the past, and the educated intelligence of the present, has deemed worthy to be called liberal. Certainly, if we choose to turn the word upside down in this fashion, to put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter, Liberalism is the designation of a party-creed, and a creed too, against which every real Liberal should fight. Of course, it is quite open to men like Lord Russell and Mr. Gladstone to disavow the narrow views of Mr. Bright, and to deliver Liberalism from the impure caresses of its pseudo-disciples; but if they do this, they concede the point, and acknowledge the truth we are contending for. On the other hand it is quite open to Mr. Bright and Mr. Baines to disavow their more enlightened allies, and to maintain that they themselves are the only true and genuine Liberals. But then Liberalism at once becomes synonymous with all that is sordid and unspiritual; is robbed of all its fascination for the higher class of minds; and may be safely left to the operation of time and chance to reveal it in its true colours.

No doubt between the Conservative-Liberals such as are some of the present ministry, and men like Mr. Bright and Mr. Williams there is a considerable intermediate class; men who grasp at the word liberal to save themselves the trouble of defining their opinions more rigidly, and who, under other circumstances, would with equal indifference have been Conservatives. These men have about the same idea of progress as Lord Dundreary had of maintaining his seniority over his brother. They have a vague idea that it ought to be maintained in some fashion; but having no consciousness that they themselves are moving forward, and not much liking the idea of being overtaken by the mob, secretly agree with themselves that it is "one of those things which no fellow can make out." The existence of this class of men does not affect our argument.

The desire to overthrow existing governments, and sympathy with that desire on the part of spectators, may be liberal, or may be inexpressibly narrow-minded. Which it shall be depends on what is likely to be substituted for the existing Government if the revolution be successful. If it be only

the exchange of one kind of brute force for another, the insurrectionists will merely have been gratifying the lowest of all human passions, namely, the hatred of authority, without the slightest advantage to their country. That is not a result for Liberals to rejoice over. Yet, unhappily, it is generally assumed among Englishmen that a sympathy with every kind of resistance to established order is a prominent sign of Liberality. Men forget that willing obedience to authority is one of the primitive and most deeply-rooted distinctions between civilization and barbarism. Such Liberalism as we speak of is cousin-german to that natural freedom familiar to us in the lines of Dryden—A genuine Liberal will not, indeed, be hoodwinked by worm-eaten traditions, or seduced into irrational servility. But as little will he allow himself to be convinced by the logic of the strongest lungs, or the facts of a half-informed press. He will be proof against all such utterly unphilosophic nonsense as a normal sympathy with rebellion; and will never allow himself to forget that Liberalism abroad may end, where Radicalism at home infallibly would end, in the destruction, and not in the advancement, of all that our higher nature feeds on—of reverence, of loyalty, and a belief in more than meets the eye.

The designs of those who, under cover of promoting the dignity of the human race, are steadily bent on the subversion of what has hitherto been found to secure it, are the great danger of the age. A struggle is in progress between mock Liberality and real: in other words, between Truth and Falsehood. We have done, therefore, what we could to elucidate the nature of the contest and explain the characters of the combatants. True Liberality, we repeat, is neither the creed nor the symbol of a party. It exists, and claims our homage, wherever respect for the ideal and the spiritual, and for culture in its highest sense, predominate over the phenomenal and material, and the pursuit of instrumental knowledge.

Joseph Wolff.



ONE of the largest-hearted and ablest-minded men of the time has just gone away from us. A powerful frame and vigorous constitution has given way at the age of sixty-six, under the wear and tear of impulses that would not suffer rest, and of unremitting exertions for others' good.

Joseph Wolff died as he lived, a poor man; because, though continually before the public as a collector of money, no part of what he collected went to enrich himself. His last public act was an appeal on behalf of Paul Pierides, whose young life he saved in Cyprus. That life, after many years of active usefulness, has been visited with great distress. The same voice which saved it has made an appeal for aid. At Joseph Wolff's request, four of his near friends, one of whom is the Editor of this Review, allowed their names to be published as ready to receive subscriptions. About 80*l.* has been received, and much more, it is hoped, will be received.

But it is not so much what he has done for others

that makes his name great as the spirit in which he has done it. Few men, indeed, have left deeper traces—few men so deep—of a beneficent life; but there was in this man, what is rarer still, the disposition to see nothing in others so much as the better side of their nature, and all such things as gave them a claim to sympathy and assistance.

The foundation of all this was his simple and childlike faith. No man knew his Bible better; no man accepted it more implicitly. An intellectual power and a varied knowledge rarely equalled were never found employed upon “foolish and unlearned questions.”

A wonderful memory, a mind well stored by reading and observation and travel, a rich fund of anecdote and illustration, a power of graphic delineation of scenes and men; a ready, but never an ill-natured, perception of the ridiculous; a deep and clinging affection, a comprehensive charity: these were some of his principal gifts. On the other hand, his temperament was ardent and impulsive to excess, and perpetually got the better of his discretion and calmer judgment. He used to say of himself that he was vain; and, no doubt the *monstrari digito* had its charms for him, as it has for most men: but there was in him, what there is not in most men, the genuine simplicity which avowed it.

This is not the place for any sketch of his many-coloured life; and, if it were, there is happily no room for making the attempt. His autobiography, a book which from its special qualities will survive its day, has left nothing to be said.

But one main feature of that life it would not be well to pass by, because it is full of hope and encouragement to us all. Joseph Wolff, having early been brought to the knowledge of Christ, made trial of many ways of following Christ, but in no one of them did he find rest till he tried the way of the Church of England. Then was his soul satisfied. In her way he walked some forty-three years, till called away to a more perfect rest. As he had lived—no temptation, though presented to him at the hands of ardent and loving and valued friends, having power even to make him doubt or misgive about the good part he had chosen—so he died. It is a great lesson, and full of teaching to all who will not refuse to hear.

How he lived and how he laboured in the Church of England we all know. Better than any other do the people of Ile Brewers know it. It is not often that less than seventeen years of possession of a poor benefice can show such a legacy. In 1845 there was in Ile Brewers no parsonage-house, no school, a church in the last stage of dilapidation and decay. In 1847 there was a good and sufficient house; not many years after there was a suitable school; 1861 saw a new church consecrated.

These are things which are not forgotten, especially when the hand from which they come was always open, yea, beyond its power, to relieve distress, and the heart and the voice were never wanting to soothe sorrow.

LAUS DEO.



Rugby School and Balliol College.



THE necessity of a sound Christian education for the youth of Great Britain and Ireland is one of the chief things we shall insist upon in this Review; and, as to us the Church of England is the exponent of Christianity, by a sound Christian education we mean education according to the doctrine and the discipline of the Church of England. Into all the branches of so great a subject we cannot, of course, enter in this place; we propose to speak of the education of that class which influences all the rest—the upper class; or, to speak after the almost necessary phraseology of the day, the upper and upper-middle sections of our society. There are few loyal members of our Church—and, in saying so, we desire to make no further distinction as to party than is represented by the word “loyal”—who have not seen cause to lament the growing laxity which has crept over the public mind as to the colour of the religious training, given along with the physical and intellectual culture of our youth, at our public schools and universities. When the growth of such indistinctness of view is rather the result of carelessness than intention, when strong motives for overlooking the importance of the subject are present to the minds of parents, when the true view of the case requires little but exposure to the face of day, it seems the duty of a paper which starts with at least a theory of examining all such questions from the side of truth and right to deal unshrinkingly with them.

There is no doubt that parents are exposed to a strong temptation to avoid looking the facts full in the face. So immensely has the proportion of those classes which make use of public schools and universities increased of late years, that, to find employment for the young men thus educated has become, beyond all comparison, more difficult than it was in the last generation. Competitive examinations for almost all public services, and the multiplication of prizes at the universities, have stimulated the struggle. But a few out of many succeed. Parents, in consequence, are in a feverish state of anxiety to secure the most approved machine by which their sons can be worked up to the required mark—not necessarily crammed, for it is found that mere cramming does not turn out generally successful—but trained in a real hard-working way, money's worth for money. If this end is to be obtained at schools or colleges where the religious element is satisfactory, so much the better; if not (we are speaking even of the better sort of parents), that consideration is dropped out of sight. Success before all things. And it has so happened that the places considered the most successful are precisely those where the more important subject is unsatisfactorily dealt with; while some, at least, of the more orthodox institutions have scarcely come up to the higher mark attained by their rivals. The boys themselves, for whom the principles of right and expediency are thus contending in sad conflict, only too readily, as might be expected where they have talent and ambition, throw their weight into the more tempting scale; and if they have perchance any true notion of the real question at issue find it easy, after the sanguine manner of their time of life, to persuade themselves, and their parents, that their own particular good sense and right-mindedness will bear them clear of all infection.

It is a disagreeable office to point out illustrations of what we mean by name, but it is best to be straightforward. We will mention Rugby School and Balliol College as the most prominent types of those we have characterized. There are many others; but these two challenge especial notice from their being under the influence of the two most distinguished writers in *Essays and Reviews*. As that unhappy book is but too true an index of a state of opinion on religious matters very widely diffused, both within and without our Church, so these establishments

are but the models on which others are framed. We will not further specify those others. Rugby glories in the possession of a head-master whose religious opinions were grave matter of suspicion before he undertook the office; who has written, if the weakest of the notorious *Essays*, one that contains all the poison of the rest within its feeble fangs; and whose volume of *Sermons* since published has, more by its faulty omissions than anything else, confirmed the belief in his unsoundness, if, indeed, the fact of the support he has given to the infidel opinions of his brother essayists, by permitting his *Essay* to go through eleven editions along with theirs, were not strong enough without further confirmation. Of the influence exercised by Mr. Jowett at Balliol it is quite unnecessary to speak; that of the other tutors is well known to be all but absolutely powerless by the side of his. Any one who reads that author's works attentively may easily conceive how his graceful and apparently earnest style, his bold though borrowed Rationalism, his suggestive and insinuating scepticism, gains an overpowering ascendant over the young and ardent minds, many of them already too well prepared at Rugby and elsewhere, submitted to his manipulation. And those who are acquainted with students of that college may easily learn how the devotion of his time and powers to the cultivation of the talents of his young admirers gives him a claim, in itself not illegitimate, on their affection, while the permission granted him in his college to lecture on that very Bible which he perverts and parodies affords him all the opportunity he requires.

What is the result, what will be the result of this unchecked declension in the standard of English educators? Can it be expected that the pupils will be wiser than their tutors? Is it not the fact that the ablest and most industrious of our youth, being the most impregnated with unsound principles, are spreading them in every direction? Are not high-churchmanship and low-churchmanship alike deemed by them foolish enthusiasm, and the more moderate sections of those parties old-fashioned and slow? Morality—how often is it in truth a real immorality!—takes with them the place of religion, reason, (so called) of faith, common sense, or at best a subtle Platonism, of creeds and primitive institutions; Christianity in all its essence evaporates, and of the residuum some monstrous form is now and then created which commands the senseless worship of those who have drifted away from all safe holding-ground. For, as has been often remarked, faith revenges itself even in this life. No true development of intellect takes place except under her influences. A shallow cleverness and a plausible logomachy are the counterfeit coin presented where she is not; and already, even at the chosen seats of the new school, there are not wanting symptoms of premature decay in the intellectual eminence they have hitherto sustained. And let any one consider the mathematical rule of geometrical progression by which such teaching as that of the essayists is propagated; how many colleges are inoculated from one school; how these men when they take a distinguished degree become the tutors of those colleges; and how many others they are then in a position to influence. Again, how many pulpits are seized by those who have had this training; how largely the press of this country is in their hands; and through these two tremendous machineries how vast a sphere is opened to their agency. It may be easy to hold such fears up to ridicule—such is the usual and the most effective weapon with which they are met, and Englishmen are proverbially too easily cowed by such means; but thoughtful men and logical reasoners will none the less entertain fears that the future Christianity of this country will be seriously affected by what is now going on amongst us. If the springs are tainted how can the stream but be foul? And if the general hold of Christianity thus becomes feeble and lifeless,—for it will extend to all literature and the education of all classes,—what about the political future of our country? He has read history to little purpose who can contemplate without shuddering the advent of another age of "light without life," the reaction from the improved Christian tone, introduced by

the Evangelicals first, and carried forward by High-churchmen next, to the dull carelessness of the last century in England, or the glittering apotheosis of intellect which the same century witnessed in France. The state too surely suffers when the Church decays, and future generations will pay for the criminal shortsightedness of this.

It is a happy thing that the remedy, an indirect one it is true, is in the hands of all who are willing to use it. The places of education to which we have referred have, in our own times, gained their prestige by a good start, by making a name, by thus attracting the highest intellect, the best material, and by their acuteness in securing the most efficient staff possible to keep up the standard. The whole amazing energy of these establishments has been brought to bear on the achievement of success at the universities. We may not think it the worthy object of such vast, sustained, and painful labour, to gain such rewards; we may consider the system overstrained, and the results of such hot-pressure unsatisfactory; but we must take things as we find them. There is much to be said on both sides even of the abstract question, but the fact is that the demand exists; it will no doubt follow the universal law and be supplied. We see how it is supplied at present. What has been done by some may be done by others. A great responsibility rests on those who are capable of raising the intellectual standard of the places to which they belong. Every boy and man sent forth with a sound foundation of earnest religion, and gaining high distinction at the universities, will plant a standard round which others will rally, and by degrees roll off the reproach at present attaching to orthodox training. Why should not those who have this end at heart clear off obstructions as unsparingly, work as zealously, and be as successful, as men of a different stamp? There could be no nobler service to Church and State than that which might be done by able young men offering to perform their part in such work for the work's sake, and not with a mere view to emolument.

But this is open only to a few. If there is any truth in what we have advanced; let parents, guardians, trustees of schools, and heads of colleges look to it. We implore them to consider well the consequences of letting any consideration whatever interfere with the one main point. Occasionally a youth may pass through the perils of a pestilential atmosphere without suffering. There are some such cases. But, as a rule, fatal disease is too surely fixed in the very constitution of the spiritual system. And let churchmen, one and all, unite in proclaiming, wherever their voice can be heard, that the ancient doctrine, the inseparability of religion from secular training, still zealously guarded for the lower classes, shall be preserved intact for the sons of gentlemen. Let them show themselves determined to have some guarantee for what that religious part of the training is by insisting upon steady and faithful adherence to the standard of the Church of England.

Convocation.



CHURCH and State Review would be imperfect without at least an occasional survey of the state and prospects of Convocation. It is true that fifty, or even twenty-five, years ago there would have been little to say on such a subject. The outer framework indeed remained, but the machinery was rusted by the disuse of nearly a century and a-half. Most persons, if they ever thought of Convocation at all, regarded it as an effete institution; and none but a few thoughtful and well-informed persons looked upon it with reverence as the great representative body of the spirituality of the realm. But the last quarter of a century has witnessed a surprising change. With the new life which has been stirring in the Church of England, her Southern Convocation has been quickened into strength and efficiency.

Slowly but surely its dormant powers have been developing; and every session it is winning increasing confidence by the wise and practical issue of most of its deliberations.

It would be tedious to enumerate the various points on which Convocation has spoken. It must be enough to say that much has been done through the reports of its Committees, that many important subjects have been debated with ability and eloquence, and many useful decisions have been arrived at on matters deeply affecting the interests of the Church. The fears which some entertained of unseemly strife in debate, or of attempts to exalt unduly the authority of the Clergy, have been proved to be without foundation; and its members, whether official or elected, have shown that they can meet and differ with due respect for one another's opinions, and with a hearty allegiance to the Crown.

Convocation has even advanced some steps towards the alteration of one of the canons, with a view to its re-enactment in an amended form. But here it has received a momentary check, in consequence of another event, which, while it also indicates the increasing vitality of the Church, opens fresh questions, and involves important considerations. We allude to the revival of the sister Convocation of the Northern province, which has an equal interest in the discussion of the twenty-ninth canon, and has been directed to take it into consideration. The Canterbury Convocation has thus an opportunity of reconsidering the whole question; and it is most desirable that both Convocations should confer together upon the true statutable method of enacting canons in an English Provincial Synod; a subject of great moment, as bearing both upon the rights and privileges of the Church, and upon the due maintenance of the Royal Supremacy.

The Act of Submission (25 Henry VIII. c. 19) may be considered as marking a new era in the history of Canon Law. It brought the whole body of Canon Law, whether foreign or English, so far as it affected the Church of England, under the cognizance and control of the Crown of England, giving validity to such part of it as was not contrariant to the customs, laws, and statutes of the realm, or to the Royal prerogative, and restraining the clergy in their Convocations for the future (such Convocations being always assembled by authority of the King's writ) from enacting any canons without the Royal assent and licence first obtained. It will appear from hence that this important act was not intended to deprive the Church of her ancient right of self-legislation; but to restrain that right within the limits absolutely necessary to the union of Church and State; withholding the Convocations of the Clergy, first, from assembling at all without the Royal licence, and next, when assembled, from executing any canons which should be contrariant to the Royal prerogative, or to the common or statute law of the realm. From this it would seem plain that when any matter is proposed to be treated of with a view to a Synodical act, it is the business of the Convocation, first to determine what it wishes to enact; then that the canon or constitution so agreed upon should be submitted to the Crown, who, as the supreme governor in the realm, should by its law officers determine whether such proposed canon is within the limits laid down by the aforesaid Act; after which, supposing it to be approved, the licence of the Crown would be granted to the Convocation to "make, promulge, and execute" the canon. This appears to us to be the meaning of the Act of Submission, a statute which, with admirable wisdom, lays down the principle upon which a Church in union with the State may exercise the right of self-legislation with due submission to the supreme authority in the State.

But the revival of the York Convocation has revived also with it an old difficulty, namely, by what means a joint and harmonious action of the two Convocations may be obtained. We speak of this as an old difficulty; for it has been felt whenever the two Synods have been active; and various expedients have been adopted to meet it.

The first and most obvious course would be the fusion of the two bodies into one; and to such a conclusion the

Lower House of the York Convocation appear to have arrived at their last session. We highly respect the desire for unity, and the mutual confidence of the two Synods which this resolution indicates; but we venture to think that the decision was hastily formed, and that the Lower House of York can hardly have considered with sufficient care the difficulties of such a step. There have, no doubt, been instances of the two Convocations sitting together; but when so assembled, they sat, not as two Provincial Synods merged into one, but as a National Synod, under some authority superior to that of either of their presidents. They were, in fact, so held only when either York was in subjection to Canterbury, or when a *Legatus à latere* exercised a primacy over both archbishops.

We doubt much whether the proposed amalgamation could take place without a serious disturbance of the old foundations on which the Synods of the English Church rest. The independent existence of the two Provincial Synods is a part of the ancient Saxon institutions of our country; and such a change might imperil the very existence of Convocation, at least in its present form.

Another course has been to debate simultaneously, but separately, in the Houses of the two Provinces; a mode which could hardly lead to united action.

A third course has been to discuss and transact the required business first in the Canterbury Synod, and then to send drafts of the proceedings to the York Synod for their concurrence.

It was thus that the Canons of 1603 were passed. They were first debated and ratified in the Convocation of Canterbury, and were then sent down to the York Synod, and obtained their consent.

A fourth mode has been the sending of Proxies elected by the Synod of York into that of Canterbury. This mode of proceeding was adopted on the occasion of the revision of our Book of Common Prayer in 1661. The Canterbury Convocation met on May 8th, in that year, in London. On November 21st the question of a revision of the Prayer-book was entered upon. The following day the Archbishop of York, then in London, received a communication from the King, pressing the subject upon the attention of his Synod; whereupon the archbishop sent a letter, signed by himself and his suffragans, requesting the Prolocutor of the York Lower House to procure a vote from the whole house for proxies to appear in the Canterbury Convocation to represent and act for the whole house. This was accordingly done; and on the 20th of December the Book of Common Prayer received the assent and subscription of both Convocations thus represented by proxy.

These are the precedents gathered from the history of Convocation. It may be doubted how far any one of them could be conveniently followed at the present time. The first seems to us impossible, and the second impractical. And of the third and fourth it may be questioned whether, considering the great advance of the Northern Province during the last 200 years in population and wealth and intelligence, the Convocation of York would now consent either to occupy so subordinate a position, or to be represented by a small executive.

It has been suggested whether joint committees of the two Convocations respectively might not be appointed who should confer together as to the questions to be brought forward, and as to the general principles upon which such questions should be determined. It is obvious that if there were any subjects on which these committees failed to come to an agreement it would be hopeless to expect it in the Synods themselves; whereas, if agreement were obtained in the committees, the same might reasonably be looked for in the bodies represented by them. Moreover, might not joint committees of both Convocations be occasionally appointed to draw up reports to be presented in the houses of both Provinces simultaneously? Generally speaking the reports of committees are adopted. Such at least has been our experience of the practice of the Convocation of Canterbury; and we may fairly expect that such will be found to be the practice of York: and

thus through the action of joint committees the two Convocations may preserve their own independence, and yet arrive at the same result.

We have no space to enter here upon the relations of the English Convocations to those of Ireland. It will probably not be long before the examples of Canterbury and York will be followed by Armagh and Dublin. And when all the Provincial Synods shall have been quickened into action, it will be time to consider seriously of a National Synod of the United Church of England and Ireland.

We should like to add one word upon the question of admitting a lay representation into Convocation. This subject has been frequently brought forward; but it does not, as yet, appear to be sufficiently understood. There is something very plausible in the idea; for all, both clergy and laity, must feel the great importance of lay co-operation. But when we seek for lay co-operation, let us seek it through the proper channels, and by legitimate modes of communication. And this cannot be through the Convocations of the clergy. What we have urged against the amalgamation of the two Convocations may be urged with even greater force against the introduction of a lay representation into either body. It would be the admitting into it of a new element. Convocation is essentially a spiritual body. As the laity are represented in Parliament, so the spirituality are represented in Convocation. Such a change, therefore, as that desired, would be far more than a reform; it would be a revolution of Convocation. It would not be an extension of its influence; it would be a change of its very nature. We should therefore at once pronounce such a proposal to be impossible. At least, it could not be effected without the intervention of Parliament; and it may be doubted whether Parliament, powerful though it is, could address itself to such a measure. And further, supposing such a change to be made, how would it affect the relations of Church and State? A representation of laymen, not in Parliament, must tend, sooner or later, to the overthrow of the Church as an establishment. It would be one step, and that an important one, towards that catastrophe. Let us not then, for want of a little consideration, encourage the designs of those who seek to do us hurt. The foundations of our Provincial Synods lie deep in the ancient constitution of our polity, and we cannot disturb them without harm and loss; for thus we may most unintentionally help those who seek a severance of Church and State, and imperil those liberties which have come down to us by a prescription of more than a thousand years.

Judgment in Synod.



HE revived powers of Convocation, within those limits which they have reached, entail a duty and responsibility upon the body commensurate with the life restored. And here, as is continually seen in other things, God's providence appoints special work to be done so soon as power is given to do it. Where human will has a part in the performance it is another question whether the work is done, or done as it should be. This is the present trial; or, at least, one great present trial of the Church of England. If the responsibility be acknowledged and accepted, very great blessings will follow; if it be ignored in blindness, or shuffled off through sloth or cowardice, ill consequences beyond our calculation will ensue.

We approach this subject painfully in connection with some recent proceedings of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

In the year of God's Grace 1860 appeared a certain volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*. The now somewhat hacknied descriptive criticism, that "what in it was true was not new, and what in it was new was not true," however just as a general estimate, was not perfectly ac-

curate. There was at least an exception. There was one point which, alas! was true as well as new. It was that a book so wholly contrariant to the faith and teaching of the Church of England should bear the names, in six out of seven of its writers, of men sworn to abide by and teach her doctrines only;—men in Holy Orders in that Church, and not a few of them in places of especial trust and authority within her pale.

It was this which gave its real importance to a work otherwise of no weight or power. It was this which attracted to it particular notice. The very same thing which made the Church's censure suitable made it also imperative that such censure should issue; because the above-named novelty withdrew the book from obscurity and fixed men's eyes upon it. "What manner of Church is this," they began to say, whether as friends or foes, "which can tolerate such a latitude in the exposition of her faith—from whose ministry, as compared with her articles and formularies, proceed such various and contrariant voices, from whose fountains issue such different waters?"

The magnitude of the question and of the evil forced itself on the notice of the world, and could not be hidden from the Church herself. It is true there were some who, without defending the Essayists, yet wished that things might run their course, trusting that the panic, as they called it, would subside of itself. It is a questionable policy, or, at any rate, one very difficult in its application for lawful authority to pass by treason on the plea that to condemn it is to give it notoriety, and so to create the evil against which it would provide. But, at any rate, here the case was disembarassed of any such perplexity before the Houses of Convocation had any opportunity of touching upon it. Whatever evil there might be on the score of notoriety, this was already *un fait accompli*. Many and rapidly successive editions of the volume; innumerable notices in periodicals and other works; the outstretched throat of infidelity everywhere rejoicing in its appearance—raising shouts of jubilee, not simply that such statements should be made, but made by men in the position of these writers—hailing the publication as "the beginning of the end," the harbinger of the overthrow of the faith of ages in the Church of England, perhaps of the Church itself, as the defender of "the faith once delivered;" last of all, a combined censure, agreed to at a private meeting of the Episcopal body, by the two archbishops and all the bishops of England and Wales; these things, and especially the last, though in itself a great mistake, had cut away all force from the plea that it were well to let the book alone, lest it should be drawn from obscurity into light by the fact of a Synodical Condemnation.

Under these circumstances the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury met on the 26th of February, 1861, and was immediately called upon to take action in the matter. On the motion of Dr. Jelf, in the Lower House, the standing orders were, with hardly a dissentient voice, suspended, for the purpose of giving priority over other business to a motion (moved also by Dr. Jelf, and seconded by Dr. M'Caul,) for "an address to the Upper House, praying the official attention of His Grace and their Lordships to the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, with a view to Synodical action in reference thereto, inasmuch as, in the judgment of this House, the book in question contains many erroneous statements, and inculcates principles contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the Articles of Religion of 1562."

The mode of proceeding was not quite clear of difficulty; for the censure of the 12th of February publicly, though not Synodically, put forth with the names of twenty-six archbishops and bishops of the English Church, gave some awkwardness to the form of the proposed address, seeming almost to preclude the Lower House from asking the Upper to do that which they had already done, viz.: consider the book with a view to its condemnation. Whilst, on the other hand, a strong desire that, if possible, an unanimous adhesion might be given to whatever resolution should be passed, was felt to throw a

difficulty in the way of an immediate condemnation, inasmuch as many members of the House declared they had not read the work, having been wholly unable, from the demands upon the booksellers, to obtain a copy. The result was, a compromise in the form of a very milk-and-water censure; an expression of thankful concurrence with the bishops in what they had done, instead of a request to them to proceed in Synod assembled, and a pious hope that pernicious effects would be averted.

It was felt by many very strongly, after the passing of this resolution, that the proceeding was unworthy of the Houses and of the grave nature of the case; and although hereupon the standing orders were not again suspended in order to re-open the question, a gravamen and petition, numerously signed, was sent from certain members of the Lower to the Upper House, praying for the appointment of a Committee to make a full examination of the book and report thereon: a proceeding which, though possibly a little awkward in form, (for the Committee should evidently have been asked for in the first instance,) was yet in substance the right thing, and indeed the only thing to do. The Upper House complied with the prayer of the petitioners, and a Committee of the Lower House was accordingly appointed "to examine the book entitled *Essays and Reviews*, and to report thereon to the Lower House, in order that the Lower House may communicate to the Upper House its opinion whether there are sufficient grounds for proceeding to a Synodical judgment upon the book."

On the 18th of June the Committee presented their report, to which, however, the House was not asked to assent in detail; but from it to draw the conclusion that "*there were sufficient grounds to proceed to a Synodical judgment upon the book*," and that the House should so report its opinion to the Upper House. After a prolonged and animated debate, extending over the session of two days, and conducted with a moderation and temper well-fitted to the gravity of the occasion and the assembly, the resolution *pur et simple*, as proposed by the Archdeacon of Taunton, and seconded by Dr. McCaul, was carried by a considerable majority. No one of those who proposed amendments making any attempt to defend or excuse the book.

This done, it remained with the Upper House to say what further proceedings should be taken. And here we approach its determination with the deepest regret. The archbishop and bishops of the Upper House, after having themselves put forth a censure, though unsynodically—after having received the addresses of numerous and anxious petitioners on the subject—after having replied to the address of the Lower House, and the numerously-signed petition from certain members of it—after having appointed a Committee thereof, to examine and report upon whether there were grounds sufficient to proceed to Synodical judgment on the same—after having received the report of the said Committee and the resolution of the Lower House in connection with it;—after all this the Upper House stayed its own hand, and stifled its own voice, and nullified its own previous action, on the ground that, as proceedings against one of the writers had been commenced by his diocesan in the court of the province, it was inexpedient, pending those proceedings, upon the ground that the archbishop and the other bishops being Privy Councillors might have to sit in the Appeal Court, to come to any Synodical judgment upon the merits of the book—its heresy or the dangers connected with it.

There are two grave questions which demand an answer here. First, is the ground alleged by the Upper House sufficient in the case? Second, if sufficient, was there any room for it under the circumstances?

To both questions the reply is clearly in the negative. Whether or no the archbishop and bishops being Privy Councillors could sit in the Appeal Court is a matter of no importance when weighed against the incalculable mischief of not proceeding straight forward to a Synodical judgment. And whether it be of great importance or of none makes no difference under the circumstances, because

the censure already unanimously agreed to at the private meeting at Lambeth would be as strong an instance of having prejudged the case, and as complete a ground for a *recusatio judicis*, as any Synodical judgment could be.

We cannot hide what is notorious to all men, and we dare not hide it if we could. The proceedings invited by the Upper House have been suspended for no reason; and Churchmen are asking themselves everywhere, sorrowfully and painfully, whether the truth of all this be, not, as is stated, an adjournment, but an abandonment, of proceedings.

There has been so much said in and out of Convocation which shows an entire misconception of what a Synodical judgment is that we must add a few words here.

Proceedings in Court Ecclesiastical and proceedings in Synod are perfectly separate and distinct, have *nothing to do with one another*, and therefore *cannot clash*. They are not *in pari materia*. They do not judge the same thing. They have not the same object, and they do not go about to compass their object in the same way. For the duty and office of the Synod in such case is to preserve intact the Faith by dogmatic declaration. It is to act as a promulgation of the Church's judgment on a matter of doctrine, irrespective of persons: as a warning voice against error, heresy, or schism, as such, and especially if found within in the Church's own pale; but still looking not to the writers as individuals, but merely to what is written, and to the position, not the persons, of the authors. It is thus to bear witness to the truth; to warn the unwary; to confirm the doubting; to restrain the over-bold or presumptuously-disposed; to help the unlearned; to teach the children of the Church where danger and sin lie, that they may not, even inadvertently, fall into the pits and snares which, "in these dangerous days," beset their path. It is to mark the error or the sin, not to try the criminal. But the office of the bishop in his court is, (though all this also incidentally,) yet in its nature and essence, judicial on his part, and personal as to those proceeded against. His course is directed not against the book as a pernicious book, but against the writer as an offender against the law of the Church. The one condemns the book as an exposition of heresy, contrary to the Faith of the Church;—the other condemns the man, as a transgressor against his legal obligation. It is but a shallow philosophy, and a faulty logic which, confusing the accidents with the essence of things, does not see this distinction, and so keeps saying that if you condemn the book you do, *pari passu*, condemn the writers. It is a failure of discrimination between a legal penalty and a moral consequence. No one indeed denies, as a fact, that an authoritative condemnation of a book may reflect upon the writer also, and so in a certain sense be said to carry with it a penalty. But still this is not a penalty in its essential character. It is not the writer as such that is dealt with:—and it is most important that this logical distinction should be borne in mind, unless we would introduce a fatal confusion of thought tending to the total abnegation of the Church's function as "having authority in controversies of Faith," and of her great duty of "bearing witness unto the Truth." Why! it is even conceivable in any given case that the writer might obtain a just acquittal as not having actually placed himself within the letter of the law, and yet the condemnation of his deed—his book—might be not only a righteous act, but an imperative duty on the part of the Church in Synod assembled. And here it is not unworthy of notice how this distinction *was* marked in the Lower House of Convocation. It *was* there suggested, in the course of the debate to which we have before alluded, that it would be hard to condemn the writers of the *Essays* behind their backs; without a hearing, without a citation to them to appear and explain their meaning. The answer was,—"*We are not sitting in judgment upon the men; we have no need, and in fact no power, to cite them to appear. If we did so, they might, and probably would, refuse to come; and even were it otherwise, it would be a confusion of ideas to seek to bring them personally before us. We merely say the book is*

worthy of the condemnation of the Church in Synod assembled, as inculcating erroneous and strange doctrine." And surely this is what the Upper House might have said and ought to have said with all weight, authority, and solemnity, if only in mercy to the little ones of Christ. And we believe it would have said so but for being led away by the error of a lax public opinion supposed to exist out of doors, which it feared would not understand the difference between a Synod condemning a book for unsound doctrine and a court trying a criminal for an illegal act, and which uninformed public opinion would perhaps consider the act of the one body as an unjust prejudgment of the question submitted to the other. But even the most ill-informed public opinion would not fail to see the distinction drawn above in a parallel secular case. In the face of an impending inundation, who would say that the possibility of some one being called upon to answer criminally for having neglected or damaged the embankments ought to act as a reason for those in authority not making full inquiry, and issuing a necessary warning as to imminent danger from a flood? In the apprehension of invasion by an enemy, who would question the lawfulness of the Government examining into, and, if needful, condemning the weak points of defence, or any vantage-ground which might fall into hostile hands, much more any indications of walls sapped, or garrisons tampered with treasonably, even though it might be that further proceedings might be taken elsewhere as to traitors within the camp? In time of plague or pestilence, when rumour perhaps asserts the wells of a district to have been poisoned, who would say that no commission of inquiry must issue, no examination be made, no report, and, if need be, condemnation of the polluted fountains be proclaimed, because it might happen that certain contractors were under arrest as not having fulfilled their duties, or as suspected of abusing their position to the poisoning of the waters? Surely, in all such cases, not only is *salus populi suprema lex*, but it would be felt and understood by all that the conclusions come to, and the declarations promulgated, would deal with the facts as they stood, irrespective of the persons who might or might not be implicated. And would any man in his senses suppose that the labours of any such commission must cease, and their condemnation of unsafe embankments, or dangerous points of assault, or poisoned waters, be suppressed and stifled, pending proceedings taken judicially against any man as a criminal in connection with such impending dangers? And the parallel really holds good even though, in the book case, the authorship being admitted, it may be said that you necessarily prejudice the writer if you condemn the book; for in any of the other cases put the argument might be the same, inasmuch as the defence in the criminal proceedings might be that, admitting the prisoner's connection with the works, the embankments were not unsound, or the fortifications were not ill constructed, or the waters were not deleterious; in which case the defence would not the less be prejudiced by an official condemnation of the state of things inquired into than the writers of the Essays would be by an authoritative condemnation of their book.

We need hardly pursue this train of thought further. We trust we have said enough to show that a very serious, and we must add, wholly superfluous error has been committed in the suspension of Synodical proceedings in this case. It is an error much to be regretted for itself and its immediate consequences, by the which, we scruple not to say, the little ones of Christ's flock have had grievous wrong done them, and many dangers increased. But even more is it to be taken as a ground of sorrow and alarm if it be received as an indication of the purpose of the Synod as to the use, rather we must say the abnegation, of her, to a certain extent, restored powers. A thousand witnesses does God give to the truth that He helps those who help themselves, but if the Church of England has been so enfeebled by the Erastianism of the day—that the highest "powers that be" in the Church come only to overlook their duties, abdicate their functions, and suppress their action, when they have again given them the power to act, we fear we can come to no other

conclusion than that the compulsory silence of a hundred and forty years was as much less hurtful as it was less guilty than such a course. We trust, however, that the Bench of Bishops in this matter were rather merely misled by a popular error, and mistaken through an unexamined and unweighed plausibility, than that they had any thought or intention of thus betraying their trust, or of consciously shrinking from their duty as guardians of the Faith in so grave a crisis. In this hope we will abide until we see what the suspension of proceedings finally amounts to—whether, that is, it be *bonâ fide* only an adjournment, or whether it is only another name for abandoning them altogether.

The Position of the Established Church in the Manufacturing Districts.



HE position of the Church may be viewed in different aspects. First, statistically, with reference to its means of public worship and ministrations, its schools, and various other material and external machinery, for promoting religion generally, or its own special tenets and polity. Secondly, with reference to its estimation in the opinion and affections of the people.

For our present consideration we select the latter aspect, as one to which passing events invite more than ordinary attention. Errors in public opinion itself, and mistakes as to the real direction of that opinion, have caused great practical evils. Fallacies have been allowed, without exposure, to take possession of the public mind; and insidious encroachments have been gradually effected without notice, till Churchmen were awakened from dreams of security and apathy by finding, that the spoliation of the Church and its separation from the State were avowed as the ulterior object to which the abolition of Church-rates was a step designed. The startling majorities in the House of Commons in favour of abolition significantly cautioned us of the dangerous consequences, resulting either from an unsound state of popular opinion, or from an erroneous estimate of its real tendency and extent. The rapid and steady dwindling of those majorities, before the aroused energies of Churchmen, encouraged us to nurture sound public opinion, and to expose the specious appearances which are confounded with it, either through want of reflection and knowledge, or through the fallacious devices of an organized association, having at its command a well-worked machinery and plenty of money.

These parties well know, and unscrupulously use, the power of what is termed "outward pressure;" a phrase which designates an effect without distinguishing the various causes by which that effect may be produced. The effect of pressure may be produced either by public opinion, properly so called, and formed deliberately under appeals to reason only, or under those retarding checks which give time for the dispersion of prejudice and passion; or the pressure may be effected by overpowering caprice or blinding excitement; or, again, by a mistaken belief of a preponderance of public will upon any subject. In establishing such a mistaken belief respecting the tendency and preponderance of public opinion or popular will, as adverse to the Church, the successful resistance of Church-rates in the manufacturing districts has been of some weight, and has induced legislators to support measures which their own judgment condemns. This success (though extending to only about five per cent. of the sum total of parishes) has been inconsiderately adopted as a demonstration of popular will so decided that resistance is useless, and the demands of the Church-rate abolitionists must be conceded.

That the chief power of dissent is in the large towns, and is therein great, admits of no question; but we deny that it is as great as it is believed to be by those who take the successful resistance of Church-rates to be an accurate

criterion of its magnitude. An examination of the issue raised, and of the parties combined, in Church-rate contests may throw some light upon the value of success, as evidence of the relative positions of the Church and dissent in the public opinion of the manufacturing districts.

1. The issue raised was simply rate or no rate—not the comparative merits of the Church or of the voluntary system—nor the question of an Established Church or no Established Church. The design of seeking Church-rate abolition only as a step to separating the Church from the State was kept in the shade. Cupidity was tempted, under colour of oppressive taxation, to appropriate to holders of property liens upon it to which they had no right. Obedience to law was represented as violation of conscience. Stage management, in putting Bibles to be seized under distress warrants, and in conferring the honours of martyrdom on persons who suffered the consequences of self-will against public law, caught the sympathies of the ignorant. There was no appeal to calm judgment even upon the rate itself, much less on the position of the Church in general estimation.

2. The parties contending were not the Church against the power of any one sect, nor the Church against the whole combination of sects; but the sects were reinforced (we believe in a very large proportion) by those allies which are easily evoked for any tumultuous purpose in large towns, with a dense population demoralized by various causes, and especially by having outstripped the means of pastoral superintendence. The irreligious, the dissolute, the idle, the turbulent, and the factious, delight in riot and profanation. As they readily answer the first call, they also readily return again and again to scenes in which they delight. The friends of order and piety shrink from these painful and disgusting doings. If once induced to discharge the naturally unattractive duty of upholding a charge upon themselves, they easily yielded to the terrorism and persecution which were used to intimidate them. The gaining of a numerical majority, by such means and by such allies, was no more to be taken as a demonstration of public opinion, properly so called, in favour of dissent, or against the Church, than would be the voice of the misguided rabble who blindly supported their envious misleaders in demanding the release of a robber and the crucifixion of the Holy One.

Not even on the mere question of rate or no rate does the successful resistance prove a numerical majority who, if calmly consulted, would support the refusal of a rate. For, under all the disadvantages and difficulties referred to, there have been trials of strength proving that the hold of the Church on the affections of the people would, if it could be brought into action, be superior to the whole combination of the sects and their motley allies. In support of this opinion we cite the Rochdale contest of 1840, the greatest recorded trial of strength on this question. No less than 13,075 votes were polled, and the rate was carried by a majority of 113. This majority was carried against personal violence and assaults so outrageous, that a large body of police were overpowered; and towards the close of the poll it was necessary to call out the military to enable the Church party to record their votes. The then rapid increase of these votes is evidence that, if protection had been sooner afforded, a much greater majority would have been gained.

It is admitted that the Church majority could not be induced to follow up this victory. They yielded to weariness of strife—to disgust at profanation—to persecution—to costly litigation, supported by the funds of a wealthy central association, evading the intent of law by a vexatious use of its imperfections. But this rather supports than invalidates the assertion, that the success achieved is not evidence of a preponderance of public opinion, or even of popular prepossession, against the Church and in favor of the voluntary system. The majority, obtained under fallacious issues and against terror and calumny, was obtained against dissenters combined, as we repeat, with the factious, the turbulent, and the irreligious. The position of the Church as compared with that of dissent is high,

even numerically, and in the large towns the strongholds of the latter.

But the central directors of the agitation (presuming that outward pressure by resistance of Church-rate had effected all it could in causing a majority of the House of Commons to believe in a decided and irresistible condemnation of Church-rates at least, if not of the Church itself) now proceeded to unmask their ulterior design. The mask, of the burden of taxation, and of oppressed conscience in the payment of Church-rates, was cast aside. Before a committee of the House of Lords the ulterior intention to separate the Church from the State, and to confiscate its temples and endowments, was openly avowed, and prominently put into the foreground of the movement.

But the effect was very different from the anticipation of the movers. It brought to light true public opinion. Churchmen were aroused into action. They appealed to the calm judgment of the people, not to excited mobs, but in tracts, in lectures, in references to history, and even to dissenting authorities. The clergy had heretofore shrunk from bitter controversy and odious comparisons with dissenters, till the latter challenged or compelled such comparisons. The challenge was unwillingly accepted by the former; but, once accepted, was fearlessly and successfully carried out. Dr. Hume's statistics—the convincing eloquence of Joseph and James Bardsley, Stowell, O'Connor, Eagar, Venables, Dr. Miller, and other clergy of the manufacturing districts, (to say nothing of those in the South,) spread light on all sides upon the venerable claims and practical usefulness of the Church, and upon the shortcomings, inconsistencies, and fallacies of dissent. The response of true public opinion was given in unmistakable clearness through the whole manufacturing districts, from Newcastle to Birmingham. Church defence, and operative auxiliary, institutions sprang into active life in Hartlepool, Durham, Leeds, Bradford, Huddersfield, Preston, Halifax, Ashton, Oldham, Manchester, Liverpool, and many other great towns, the vaunted strongholds of dissent. Church lecturers there addressed, with success and welcome, large audiences freely admitted, and left dissenters unmolested to do the same. The alarm with which the latter regarded the effects of these fair appeals to reason was speedily manifested, in their spasmodic agitation to stifle the religious census honestly challenged by the Church—in the pharisaical attempt to throw dust into the eyes of the people, to exalt themselves, and to lower the Church, by means of the "Bicentenary" bubble—and lastly in rude and lawless interruptions at Hartlepool, Birmingham, and Huddersfield, to drown lectures which they dared not leave to the free judgment of the people. The mere political dissenters, and those who represent hostility to the Church to be the essential principle of their creed, have made a great blunder in challenging an appeal to public opinion, and they know it. Not only have they aroused in Churchmen a spirit of defence and inquiry, but they have presented to the notice of pious and well-meaning men (prepossessed against, but not ill-disposed towards, the Church) materials for thought and information on subjects heretofore mystified and misrepresented. There are signs that many of these will discern the truth, and be gathered into the Church. We were informed by a clergyman that, after the Rev. Joseph Bardsley's lecture in the Free Trade Hall at Manchester, nine dissenters declared themselves convinced, that the objections to the Church were unfounded, and expressed their determination to join it.* The holy activity of her clergy in these districts,—the proofs that the preaching of the Gospel to the poor, not the desertion of them for more profitable localities, is the policy of the Church, and is practically secured by its endowments,—the demonstrations that a Church with its pastoral charge and lawfully defined district is widely different from a building and minister merely for prayer and preaching,—the dissemination of

* See *A Contrast between Conscientious Nonconformity and Factious Dissent*, presented in the *Christian Appeals* of Edward Ash, M.D., to Nonconformists; and especially in his *Right Way of Commemorating the Bicentenary of 1862*.—Wertheim and Macintosh. Price 2d.

these facts is doing its work among the thoughtful and intelligent people of the North. The position of the Church in their estimation has been rapidly improving, and will receive a glorious impetus from the assaults intended to lower it—if not to sink it altogether.

On the Evidence for the Existence of Infidelity.



HAT there exists within the pale of Christendom an alarming and distressing amount of infidelity is, unhappily, a fact beyond the reach of dispute. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that unbelievers may overrate the amount of their own numbers, and we are about to suggest some reasons why such an error on their part should be extremely probable.

We must begin by the admission that the mistake of exaggerating the size and influence of one's own party, combined with a proportionately lowering estimate of the opposing ranks, is by no means confined to any one particular sect or school of thinkers. We are all naturally inclined to look upon our own world as *the* world. To give one illustration of this principle, out of many that might be selected, we may for the moment refer to the *First Impressions of England*, by a Scotch Presbyterian, the late Hugh Miller. In that work the author sets forth an explanation of the unconscious self-deceit practised by English dissenters in their estimate of the relative forces of those opposed or attached to the Church of England. He shows how, by living among themselves, by frequenting their own inns, by dealing with their own shops and the like, they contrive to remain in a state of well-nigh invincible ignorance of the strong hold which the Church retains upon the affections of the majority of the nation.

But in the case of an energetic sect, which holds anything like a positive creed, this sort of ignorance must necessarily, from time to time, receive some very rude shocks, such as may at the least serve to shake if not to overthrow its self-confidence. A creed must needs lead to action, and action inevitably discloses unforeseen weaknesses. To raise a chapel or a college, to carry through Parliament some cherished scheme of national education, to send out missionaries to the heathen, these and similar attempts tend to reveal the real condition of the power and influence possessed by a given community. The funds are not easily raised, fit teachers for the various branches of knowledge are not at hand, the strength and tenacity of opponents proves far greater than was anticipated, and though some progress is ultimately effected, yet many a sanguine adherent has in the meanwhile become a sadder and less hopeful, though it may be at the same time, a wiser man.

But to the professors of a merely negative theology these startling revelations are but rarely vouchsafed. Engaged simply in undoing, they need scarcely face the difficulties which confront every earnest Christian community which, in its degree and according to its light, is engaged in attempting to build up. Unbelievers (at least the highly cultivated ones, who are at present more especially in our thoughts) seldom make serious and self-denying endeavours to found institutions, or to frame laws, or send ambassadors to distant tribes. To gain a footing in existing seminaries, to guide legislation in a latitudinarian direction, and to keep up certain organs of opinion, seem to be much more congenial avocations. Such tasks being comparatively easy, do not necessitate the same stern looking of facts in the face as those more aggressive ones to which we have previously referred.

But not only does such a measure of success as may attend these efforts on the part of sceptics tend to fan their hopes, they also derive a considerable degree of support from a mistaken view of human nature. Most of us, who are not either open reprobates on the one hand, or models

of saintly and heroic virtue on the other—in other words a majority of mankind—are so changeful and inconsistent as to resemble two distinct persons. Now it is the common error of worldly and sceptical minds to assume that the lightest aspect of another's character is the truest. Whereas, on the contrary, nothing is more certain than that many a one whose life and conversation gave but too much countenance to the notion that he was an unbeliever, or else quite careless of religion, has exhibited in sickness or in danger substantial proof, that a deeper and better self had all the while lain hid under a seemingly frivolous or materialised exterior. The man who talked lightly about religion over his wine has constantly displayed a very different demeanour in illness, or shipwreck, or captivity. Even the avowed sceptic has not always sufficient confidence in his professed conclusions to carry them out consistently. D'Alembert commenced his will in the name of the Holy Trinity; Diderot gave his sons a religious education; neither Rousseau nor Voltaire professed to feel any security upon the subject of future punishment; and a celebrated gambler and profligate who died in 1732, Colonel Charteris, is believed to have offered 30,000*l.* to any one who would assure him that there was no such place as hell. And yet most of those just named would be claimed by the sceptic as the very leaders and apostles of unbelief. The greater, the more signal their inconsistency! In truth, hard as is the task to be a consistent Christian, it is still more difficult to be a consistent unbeliever.

"Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret,"

excepting where the expulsive principle is the loftier and more potent one of Divine Grace.

To return, however, to our infidel, who is thus summing the number of his allies. Having counted as on his side the greater number of those of whose levity and want of confirmed principle he has had some evidence, he may probably proceed to claim a very large staff of literary coadjutors. Here, again, he has but too much reason for his vaunt: and yet we cannot doubt but that it is often proclaimed far too loudly. Thus, for instance, the author of a celebrated article in the *Westminster Review*, for October, 1860, assures us, that "the newspaper, the review, the tale by every fireside, are written almost exclusively by men who have long ceased to believe. So, also, the school-book, the text-book, the manuals for study of youth and manhood, the whole mental food of the day; science, history, morals and politics, poetry and fiction." What the writer probably means is that he himself belongs to a set who would look upon this state of things as a desirable consummation. For that any man should really believe it to be a true picture of existing facts must surpass, we should imagine, the credulity even of *Westminster Reviewers*, credulous as they are upon points where they wish to believe. Waiving the question of anonymous writing, on which the evidence would be too complex for us to analyse in this brief sketch, we should like to ask, where is the proof that the Laureate, or Robert Browning, or the late Elizabeth Browning, or Adelaide Procter, have long ceased to believe? At what period did this deluge of utter scepticism engulf Messrs. Dickens, Thackeray, Trollope, Sir E. B. Lytton? Where is the proof of unbelief in the works of Dr. Whewell, Sir Wm. Hamilton, Mr. Hallam, Lord Macaulay, Professor Owen, Sir John Herschell, and the long list which might be extended until the four or five really eminent writers of the sceptical school would be seen to form but a small fraction of the staff of British authors of our time? (We here confine ourselves to Great Britain, partly because it is of our own country only that the reviewer whom we quote is speaking, and partly because we are less immediately concerned with other lands.) As for manuals and dictionaries, the most prominent are those produced by Dr. Wm. Smith and his *collaborateurs*; and though we may not always approve of their tone, it would be the height of uncharitableness to stigmatize it as infidel. As regards the clergy, it were strange indeed if, among some 18,000, there were no black

sheep in point of faith as well practice ; but to pretend that, (in more than some very few and exceptional cases) they disbelieve what they teach, is simply a scandalous libel. Indeed, the more courteous and tolerant among sceptics do not profess to bring against the clergy any such frightful charge ; they are content to say that the profession of a teacher has so warped the minds of those who have undertaken the office, that they cannot be looked upon as unprejudiced witnesses. In speaking thus, they indeed tacitly assume that they themselves are quite free from all bias. Alas ! too often they have a keen interest in denying truths which they have reason to fear may be intimately connected with their own lot ; and thus this imagined freedom from prejudice is but one more instance of their self-deception. Another time we may perhaps attempt to show cause why even a triumph of unbelief in any country can never be expected to endure for more than a short time.

Marriage Licence, Special and Ordinary.

 HE granting of licence ordinary for marriage is part of the old dispensing power exercised by Archbishops and Bishops, and was preserved to them by 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21. The same statute preserves to the Archbishop of Canterbury and his successors the granting of special licence. These powers have been recognized in our Marriage Acts from time to time, and are part of the present law.

The granting of a licence, special or ordinary, is purely a matter of grace, so that no Archbishop or Bishop who sees fit to withhold it can be called in question for his refusal.

A licence is commonly regarded only as a piece of luxury and magnificence ; part of the paraphernalia of a wedding ; and little is thought, or perhaps known, of the solemn words in which it runs. This is not wonderful in the parties who seek and obtain it. But the question is about those who grant it.

There is, then, a very grave scandal which has arisen within the last two or three years out of the general legalizing of divorce, and out of the marriage by licence—of which there has been already one, if not more instances—between the parties whose adultery has been the ground of divorce.

Now, whatever may be said by some about the Scriptural authority for divorce in cases of adultery, no one pretends that the intermarriage of the adulterous persons can be reconciled with Scripture. But, nevertheless, such persons apply for and obtain a licence for marriage. They have no mind to face publication of banns, and find that they may more secretly and conveniently be married by licence.

Now, observe the form in which a licence runs:—*“To our beloved in Christ, health. Whereas it is alleged that ye are desirous to proceed to the solemnization of true and lawful matrimony, we, being willing that these your desires may the more speedily obtain a due effect, and to the end that this marriage may be publicly and lawfully solemnized . . . according to the rites of the Book of Common prayer . . . for lawful causes, graciously grant this our licence and faculty, &c. &c.”*

It will not, we presume, be contended that these are fitting expressions to be addressed, and fitting permission to be given, to persons who are preparing to break Christ's law ; or that such permission is to be made matter of special favour and encouragement on the part of Christ's chief ministers. If the law of the land makes such a marriage legal, no man will say, at least no Churchman can say, that “legal” is necessarily the same as “true and lawful,” or that it can be the same in this case. We shall never counsel disobedience to existing law ; but to obey law is one thing ; to volunteer acts which the law does not require to be done is another thing.

The point, then, we would submit is this, that in no such case may licence for marriage, ordinary or special, lawfully be granted ; and that it should be well understood throughout every diocese, and especially by all surrogates and other official persons, that this is the rule of the diocese. In these days of failure of spiritual discipline it would be something, however small in itself, to see the Archbishops and Bishops exercising their legitimate and undisputed authority to this extent. It would be something to see the name of Christ not invoked, and the giving due effect to true and lawful desires predicated by His chief ministers in giving formal permission to sin.

Our attention having been urgently called to this matter, we would strongly urge upon clergy and laity in every diocese that they represent the case to their diocesan. It must have escaped the notice of the Archbishops and Bishops ; and there can be no doubt that a respectful petition to them, in the sense of what has been here set down, would have its prayer granted, and that one at least of the causes of scandal and offence and reproach by the adversary, arising out of our internal condition, would thereby be done away.

We desire here to guard against a possible imputation that, in our judgment, such marriages may lawfully be had after banns, but not by licence ; we regard both as equally breaches of Gospel law and profanations of the Prayer-book. But we would not have Archbishops and Bishops go out of their way to give facilities for sin. Such marriages may be legally celebrated at the Registrar's office.

Committee of Council on Education and their Codes.

OMBINATION, pro-Parliamentary and Parliamentary, is a good thing for purposes of defence, and now and then for purposes of assault ; but it may be had too dear. It has just defeated, or appeared to defeat, for the real issue is not so clear, the re-Revised Code of Mr. Lowe.

Now many men are very happy about this, and go about congratulating one another. One man thinks that the training colleges are safe, another is glad about managers, another about masters and mistresses, another about pupil-teachers. Some go as far as to say, with especial blindness, real or assumed, to primary facts of the case, that no harm has been done to the principle of religious teaching in schools of the Church. In short, people very generally appear to think that, after all, things are to go on very much as they did before. But no one appears to think that much is going to be done to help the poorest ; the lack of which help, as contrasted with the help given to the richest, has been the main blot of the old system. There has been a defeat and a victory over a very unpopular thing, and a very unpopular man, and this is pretty much the amount of it—

““ And everybody praised the man
Who this great fight did win,
But what good came of it at last ?
Quoth little Peterkin ;
‘ Why that I cannot tell,’ said he,
‘ But ’twas a famous victory.’ ”

Now we, too, are very glad of the defeat, because there seems no room to doubt that the re-Revised Code and its author deserved any amount of defeat, not so much because of the ostensible principles of the Code, for these are in themselves unobjectionable and even praiseworthy, as because of its negations, and the manner in which both principles and negations were handled, and all brought to bear against the Church.

But we are not glad of the victory, because we are neither satisfied with the quantity nor with the quality of it ; neither with the way in which it has been achieved, nor with what has been achieved. And if any man, ob-

serving the compliments and the courtesies of the early part of the evening of Monday, May 5, in the House of Commons, when—

“ Friends to congratulate their friends made haste,
And old inveterate foes saluted as they past,”

should have inferred from them that all was nicely settled, he must have had his repose unpleasantly disturbed at its close by the majority of seven, in a house of 320 members, upon the primary issue presented by Mr. Walter's motion.

A piece of patchwork like that now turned out of the Westminster workshop is not going to hold together. It includes all the chief blots of the old system; only it is less pleasant to look at because the harmony of the colouring is much disturbed by bits done in here and there by a new hand.

There are some vicious principles, or, at least, some faulty applications of principles good in themselves, which underlie the whole arrangement, and which, quite apart from all considerations of economy, or of political hostility to the Church as supposed to be especially interested in its preservation, make its existence very precarious now that attention has been more closely called to it. For example, the principle of giving aid out of the parliamentary grant in proportion to the amount locally contributed is excellent as a general principle of public economy, but is only very partially applicable in the present case, because any rigorous adherence to it is inconsistent with the primary object of Parliament in making the grant at all, viz. the bringing school teaching within the reach of the poorest. Again, the restrictions upon the management of schools under the “management clauses,” never tolerable, have their injustice more developed in proportion as it is seen that it is not the way to make clergy and laity work harmoniously together, to proceed upon a jealousy of the clergy for which there is no sufficient ground. Again, that the possession of a certificate of some kind by a teacher should be a necessary condition of aid is ~~found not~~ only to be unjust in proportion as the maintenance of the teacher is thrown more upon the managers, but it is ~~seen~~ to be unwise, and to be conceived in ignorance of facts which make the employment of certificated teachers every day more a matter of difficulty in the country parishes. All these vexations and unnecessary interferences with the liberty of the subject cannot ultimately be maintained. There is no fear that without certificates the supply of fitting teachers either in town or country will fall short of the demand. It may all be very convenient to have training colleges subsidized at the rate of from 90 to 100 per cent. It may be all very reasonable in Sir James Kaye Shuttleworth to make desperate efforts to avert the fate of his unhealthy offspring, but that is his affair, not ours, and we had rather not be called into consultation in the case.

The main mischief remains; that which we had specially in view when we said that combination may be had too dear. Mr. Lowe's attempt to follow up the blow aimed at the National Church by the majority of the Royal Commissioners in proposing to confine State aid to the encouragement of secular teaching—a blow only not dealt because of the protest of the minority—and thus to separate between the interest of the State and the interest of the Church in the religious teaching of Church of England schools, has not been disguised. It does not matter much to the Church what Mr. Lowe may say or do, but it matters a great deal to the Church upon what principles she meets Mr. Lowe and his friends. Now, with some few exceptions, the opposition of Churchmen to his Code has played into his hands. What has been extracted from him by main force is stuffed into a footnote, and the whole amount of it is negative. The combination which has produced the glorious victory, and the patchwork flag under which opposite parties are marching now, has set aside, from first to last, as inconvenient and improper, all reference to the special relations which subsist between the State and the Church of England in respect of religion and religious teaching, and has found a way which to Churchmen has no soundness in it, because

the assertion of distinctive doctrines is no part of it, and which has no application to the case, because the Nonconformist position in relation to the State, and the Church position in the same relation, which it deals with as though they were one and the same thing, are two things essentially distinct.

We think, therefore, that the victory, such as it is, has been bought too dear, and we recognize in the combination which has produced it a laxity about creeds and formularies which is the parent of indifference to dogma, and a want of clear and accurate perception of what is meant by “Church and State.”

The International Exhibition of 1862.



MONTH has elapsed since the opening of the Great International Exhibition to the public, yet even now the vast aggregation of the multifarious products of art and manufacture assembled in the huge, unsightly pile at Brompton can scarcely be said to be reduced to complete order. Many blunders of arrangement have, however, been rectified. A way has been opened through the blocked-up nave, and the communications between the *annexés* and the principal parts of the main building have been much improved. Fine works which were huddled away in corners have been disinterred, and placed in more fitting positions, while inferior productions, which had, somehow or other, hustled themselves into the most conspicuous places in the building, have been made to retire to parts more in accordance with their merits, and in which, if they had been so placed at first, their good points, if they have any, would have been sure to find acknowledgment, instead of their obvious defects being loudly and angrily challenged when placed in the front rank, to the exclusion, in many instances, of works of the highest merit. These ameliorations have been the result of the determined attitude assumed by the newspaper-press, backed by public feeling, as the press will always be when not exceeding the limit of its legitimate powers. The thorough independence of our press is, in fact, one of the results of our free constitution, of which we may be the most proud.

At the ceremonial of the inaugurative opening we observed the reporter of the *Times*, and other reporters too, in the best places of the foremost row of the reserved-seats, the very *élite* of the peerage and the prelacy sitting behind them in far inferior positions. But was any subservience purchased by this preferment—not a single word. Nor, in all probability, was any influence sought or hoped for, even by the unpopular commissioners, to whom a little printed flattery in the columns of a leading paper might have acted pleasingly as a gently soothing unction, after the storm of reprobation raised by the jobbery which has resulted in the creation of such a truly hideous mass of brick and mortar, and the utter want of taste and judgment which afterwards so badly distributed the beautiful products forwarded from all parts of the world to our great decennial Exhibition. But as all has been made right at last, or nearly so, if we can but make sure of every vestige of the monster-shed being swept away after the Exhibition is over, we may very well forget former grievances, and enjoy the spectacle of the most magnificent assemblage of works of art, science, and manufacture, including specimens of natural produce, that the world ever saw assembled.

It is true that some few objects of exalted merit, which were among the chief attractions of the Crystal Palace of 1851, will not be equalled by any single work of precisely the same class in the present Exhibition. In bronze statues, for instance, there is nothing equal to the famous *Amazon*, by Kiss of Berlin, or, perhaps, to Baron Marochetti's *Richard Cœur-de-Lion*. Nothing that will entirely supply the place of Ostler's glistening fountain of glass, that cast up its cooling spray where the great transept intersected the noble length of the well-remembered naver.

Nor will the statues of the Austrian-court, with the novelty of its veiled figures, be altogether equalled on the present occasion, nor some few other of the individual features of the '51; yet, on the whole, the present display shows vast and brilliant progress in almost every branch of art and manufacture. The exhibitors are full a third more numerous, and their products are more lavishly exhibited, in a building which, with all its defects, is nearly half as large again as its predecessor, though, from its plan, it does not look so large from any point of the interior at which the spectator can place himself.

Among the sculptures distributed about the nave and transepts the tinted statuary of our countryman, Gibson, has a sort of claim to be first named. The experiment of tinting is a bold one, and, though a bold one, has yet been timidly executed, which is, perhaps, the cause of its very imperfect success. In the *Venus*, the partial drapery is left white, which has the effect of making the very moderate browning of the flesh to appear dark and heavy. The contrast of a subdued purple drapery would have given life and lightness to flesh-tone, which suffers from the juxtaposition of white, and still more from the masses of a brighter tone of the same colour injudiciously employed in the pavilion which has been erected to receive the Gibson statues.

The statuary in the Roman-court has proved very attractive, though not all of the highest class, with the exception of the two statues by Mr. Storey, his *Cleopatra* and *Lybian Sibyl*. The *California*, by Hiram Powers, in this transept, is rather too like the *Greek Slave*, but in many respects better. The *Prometheus Bound* is a fine piece of sculpture; the ineffectual attempt of the chained arms to ward off the fearful beak of the vulture is very finely expressed. A statue of *Socrates* cannot fail to be remarked; the face is raised, as in the act of addressing a crowd, and in the expression of the features there is a fine mingling of the higher intellectual powers with a sarcastic yet pleasant humour which accords with the known character of the greatest of the Greeks. A fine group of *Cupid binding a Satyr*, is intended to be symbolic of intellectual love subduing animal passion, and expresses its object with good effect. Then there is a graceful *Musidora* commissioned by Lord Belper, as the inscription tells us, of Odoardo Cchiotto, of Florence. A *Praying Girl*, in mediæval costume, is, on the whole, well-studied, but too realistic. These are samples of from one hundred or more statues of a superior class, which are studded about the nave and transepts, as are the bronzes we are about to allude to, which are also not included in the array of sculpture in the great picture-galleries and adjoining chambers.

Of bronze statuary the Swedish group by Molin, *A Combat à l'outrance*, between two athletic figures strapped together, each armed with a sharp knife, is the most remarkable specimen. The story of love and jealousy which has led to the fight for life is represented in low basso-relievo in the pedestal, accompanied by inscriptions in ancient runic characters, along with singularly characteristic ornaments. There is a bronze statue by Geefs, called *Le Vainqueur*. Footsore, lame, and hungered, the destined conqueror of his toil, whatever it may be, yet presses forward, the motto being, *Courage, vertu, et persévérance surmontent tous obstacles*. The Compagnie Anonyme des Bronzes, at Brussels, exhibit a *Quoit-player*, which has considerable merit; and there are many other life-size bronze statues and groups.

The picture-gallery, however, still draws, as during the first week of the Exhibition, by far the greatest number of spectators. This feature of the international contest for pre-eminence in the arts of peace being a novelty; one first inaugurated in the Parisian "Palace of Industry" in 1855, and adopted in our decennial art-festival to give more entire completeness to our display. The pictures illustrative of the English school commence with the works of Hogarth, and carry forward the history of painting in England to the present day, by works of Reynolds, Gainsborough, West, Opie, Lawrence, Fuseli, Harlowe, Constable, Collins, Furnes, Wilkie, Landseer, and Maclise,

whose first oil-painting, *The Veiled Prophet*, bears its reappearance well. These names, with others of equal interest, bring us to all the well-known artists of the day, the progress of whose works we have watched from year to year in our annual exhibitions; and the sight of a rich gleanings from many successive years is, therefore, a very interesting and pleasant sight—bringing before us favourite works long since absorbed into private galleries, and that, but for this great gathering, we should, in all probability, have never seen again.

The illustrations of the French school of painting, with few exceptions, do not extend farther back than some thirty years or so, being chiefly works of living painters, or of those who, with an ordinary share of longevity, might have been now alive. The great differences that all will at once perceive between the French and English schools are, first, the far more subdued tone of colour, and the generally larger scale of the works of French artists; secondly, their superiority in drawing; and, thirdly, the greater amount of thought that has very frequently formed the basis of the best works of the French school. These important features will not at first be appreciated by an English public. The warm, vivid colouring, and easily-understood sentiment, most frequently of a partly domestic character, that distinguish the works of the English school, are capable of being appreciated so much more readily, that the amount of thoughtful artistic insight necessary to estimate the highest qualities of French art will not at first be acquired. The pictures of Rosa Borhem were quickly understood, because we had had a Landseer and a Sydney Cooper to pave the way for their reception. But Ingres, De la Roche, Horace Vernet, De la Croix, have had no English predecessors, and the highest characteristics of their works must be studied well before opinions are ventured upon productions of such high excellence. The chief display of French statuary occupies the middle of that part of the great gallery of which the walls are occupied by the French pictures; and in an adjoining gallery is a display of engravings, lithographs, medals, intaglios, and other minor branches of fine art.

With the German school we perceive at present, even after a month's acquaintance, less public sympathy than even with the French. But the Belgian gallery appears to find more ready acceptance, and the great historical pictures of one Flemish artist are, in particular, of the very highest class. We refer to those of Louis Gallait. *The Last Honours paid to the Counts Egmont and Horn*, painted by this artist for the town of Tournai, is very grandly conceived and painted. It is richer in colour than those of the French school, and is sure to attract the attention of thoughtful artists, if not of the general public. *The Anguish of Delilah of the Betrayal*, by the same painter, is also finely conceived, although the somewhat Rubensesque figures elicited from a French critic, as we stood near, the gently depreciatory exclamation, "*Eh! nous sommes donc ici en pleine Flandre.*" But the pictures that attract the crowd in the Belgian-gallery are the *genre* pictures, especially Diller's capital little painting *Taking Toll at the Bridge*, in which three gay young Zealanders with their *chère amies*, in their picturesque but simple costume, arrive at a little plank-bridge; one couple is in the act of passing, and the girl turns up one of the very sweetest young faces ever wrought by a painter, to pay the usual toll of a kiss. The other pairs are playfully coquetting before their turn to undergo the coming ordeal, which, however, they do not appear to consider a very alarming one.

The Russian, Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish, and after that, the Italian galleries, have all their points of almost endless interest. There never was such a picture-feast offered to a greedy public at a shilling a head since exhibitions were invented. And then, to each national section of paintings there is an annexed gallery of minor art-works, such as cameos, water-colour paintings, enamels, high-class carvings, and objects of art of a hundred other kinds.

In goldsmiths' work of an artistic kind the finest object in the Exhibition is, perhaps, M. Christoffe's grand table-piece, consisting of the impersonification of the city

of Paris borne on a shield held aloft by four finely-modeled figures, occupying the centre of a splendid galley. The crowd of other figures and the whole accessories of this splendid piece will continue to attract the greatest amount of public curiosity to the last, as will a whole host of beautiful things in the French-courts, no less than the assemblage of English art-ware of gold and silver, especially the noble shields and vases of Messrs. Elkington, Hancock, Gerrard, Hunt and Roskell, and others; the greater works being surrounded as they are by a brilliant display of minor jewellery. But to press into a short article such a general list as would give even a vague idea of the marvellous gathering is sheerly impossible. There are wonders of iron-work, of brass, and of every other metal, while whole galleries are filled with wonderful machinery, and others with the countless products of the loom; the lace-cushion, (how our ladies will linger over the display of French and Belgian lace); and there are endless marvels of embroidery; and all this, in addition to the tons upon tons of natural products, brought from every corner of the earth. In short, the only way to sum up is to say at once that we have now at Brompton all the wonders of the memorable 1851 on a still more colossal scale.

One who sees all this cannot but feel inclined to allow that enormous difficulties had to be overcome in locating such an assemblage, even with decent propriety, and with this conviction he may well, we think, overlook all the shortcomings of our hard-working commissioners, and suppress further criticism on their result.

But, after all, are the effects of great International Exhibitions peaceful and anger-subduing in their character? We have been told, and we have seen too, that the great event of 1851, so loudly announced as a harbinger of universal peace, was followed by the fierce struggle in the Crimea,—one of the most terrific, for its extent, that the world has ever known; that the fairest plains of Lombardy have been made vast scenes of slaughter, on a scale of fearful magnitude; we have seen Naples and Sicily the scene not only of honourable war, but of the most atrocious brigandage; while, in America, internecine war has assumed proportions that no civil contest ever exhibited in the history of the world. Yet a little examination, a little probing beneath the surface, will show us that these terrific symptoms are yet but superficial ones, the fearful skin-diseases of society at a transitional epoch, which will leave the great social constitution all the purer at the core. And there can be no doubt that these international gatherings, these bringings together of the real wealth-producers of all nations—the real creators of national power—are, though in unseen ways, rapidly aiding in that great work of pacification by a milder but more certain process.

Modern Credulity.



STURDY old Samuel Johnson once said that there was nothing of which he would not undertake to persuade a Frenchman in a foreign country. "I'll carry a Frenchman," he says, "to St. Paul's Church-yard, and I'll tell him, by our law you may walk half way round the church, but if you walk round the whole you will be punished capitally; and he will believe me at once." To which replied Mr. James Boswell, "The Frenchman's credulity must be owing to his being accustomed to implicit submission; whereas every Englishman reasons upon the laws of his country, and instructs his representatives who compose the legislature." Had both these worthies lived to see this spirit-rapping, biological, fortune-telling nineteenth century, they would probably have changed their opinion on this as on many other points. Doctor Johnson would have found out that Frenchmen are not the only, or the chief, victims of credulity; and Boswell would have discovered that hundreds of thousands out of every million of Englishmen never reason at all, or attempt to reason, but when unreasoning obedience is the only path which rational

beings can be supposed to choose. Johnson himself, though a believer in the Cock-lane ghost, could never have swallowed the spiritual enormities of Mrs. Mazer in S. Martin's-lane, the volatility of heavy Mr. Hume, or the auriferous cunning of Mr. Forster. Men and women of that day who travelled in waggons, or in stage-coaches almost as slow, when it took a week to send a letter to the Land's End, and the squire who went up to "Lunnon" took leave of his friends with a doleful uncertainty as to whether he should ever see them again, when witches narrowly escaped burning, and scrofula was cured by "the royal touch," would nevertheless have found it hard to exceed the gross, insatiable, credulity of 1862. However wide-spread and intolerable then, it is more hopeless, abundant, and intolerable at the present day. We may believe in electric-telegraphs, express-trains, and anemometers; but men of all ranks and classes prostitute their power of judging, and their capacity of belief, to the mere love of coarse, vulgar excitement. The belief in spirit-rapping, table-turning, fortune-telling, and other such lying impostures, is set down too often to ignorance and credulity. But any such dogma as this must embrace elements of so contradictory a nature as to defy combination. *Hodge* far down in the wilds of Devonshire believes that his old Sarah (his wife or his grey mare) is bewitched; he goes, therefore, at once to Old Betty the cunning-woman, and for a half-crown receives the pleasing tidings that Sarah can only be cured by his saying the Lord's Prayer backwards twice, and eating a piece of raw cabbage-stump every day for a week fasting. All this sounds possible enough in *Hodge's* case, but how is it to apply to the exquisite Sir Bulwer, who in a May-fair studio may concoct the elixir-of-life, and, if he did so, would find endless purchasers at a thousand guineas an ounce; or, at an evening *séance* of scientific duchesses and hysterical admirers, may introduce the last *sensationally* magnetized patient who can by his new theory read with her elbows, her stomach, or the back of her head? Of course, *Hodge* is imposed on because of his gross ignorance and brutish credulity; but what is to be said for the dandies and damsels in Piccadilly? What is to be said of the thousands who read the *Strange Story*, and have a sort of itching inclination to believe the lying wonders they read? Even those who dare to disbelieve wish that Bulwer had been a little more explicit, had told us a little more of the divining rod, its nature and use, how to fashion it, and, above all, how to make it divine. They would like to know how much a man of such intellectual power as the author really believes of the luminous shadow, the magnetic will, and all the other magical, mysterious elements of occult philosophy. If *Hodge*, in his ignorance, were to propound any such scheme as boiling a cauldron full of the elixir-of-life, of invoking or evoking luminous shadows, of picking locks with spiritual-keys, the whole scheme would be simply denounced as an imposture: but when the author is a man well-clad in mind and body, has guineas in his pocket, and lofty ideas in his brain; if he can write a morbid love-story, and paint a good villain, he soon numbers his disciples by the thousand, assumes by acclamation the title of philosopher, and is hailed possibly as a benefactor of mankind. He is crowned with brazen adulation, and enriched with the golden incense of a more precious metal. No matter how flimsy the superstition to which he appeals, or fanciful the theory which he propounds; no matter how transparent the folly which he interweaves with his philosophy; *populus vult decipi*, and deceived they must and will be in some shape or other.

The truth is that there is now prevalent amongst us a strong and general belief in occult influences. People like to have something to do with that "other world;" at first only a little, and provided it is quite safe; afterwards they indulge more freely and with less anxiety as to the lawfulness of the quest. The noodle, therefore, in Belgravian goes to Bryanstone-square and pays his guinea to Mr. Reynard Foxy, the famous clairvoyant, spiritualist, and medium. This gentleman introduces him to the spirit of William Shakespeare or of the late Mr. Greenacre,

Diogenes, or Dousterswivel, as his taste may incline. In this, as in another entertainment of a far less ætherial kind, you pay your guinea, or paltry copper, and you take your choice. But, whether you hold converse with one spirit or with fifty, the result is ever "one only and the same;" the transference of so much lawful coin from the pocket of the disciple to that of the sage. No other result has, in fact, ever been known to follow. The spirits who are summoned, who manifest their presence by kicking, pinching, scratching, or by playing invisible accordions, who are skilled in all languages, and wise with all knowledge, who can glance through all time, space, and matter, have never added one single fact to the domain of science, nor aided the cause of suffering humanity by any one exertion of their pretended powers of vision, intelligence, or skill. Nothing useful, nothing wise, nothing beautiful, nothing of wit, nothing of good before unknown, has ever come of all the guinea's worth. Brave men have been nobly perilling their lives in the icy Polar seas, but the spirits who could see through a mile-stone, or look into the middle of next week, were unable to get so far north; there has always been some hapless flaw in the crystal, some want of faith in the questioner, or some fatal loophole of escape from the question. The heroes of the Northern Sea died gloriously in the snow, as the spirits *saw*, of course, in the exact way, and at the exact time they *knew*, but unfortunately could not reveal. And as spiritualism has been thus impotent on behalf of virtue, equally powerless has it been in the detection of crime. As Franklin and his brave companions one by one perished in that far-off dreary waste, so Bill Sykes eluded police, detectives, and spirit-rappers, and carried away with him the pocket-book full of notes belonging to the man found garotted in Lavender-court.

Why will not some amiable victim of hysteria, who describes houses fifty miles off and the inmates whom she never saw (but whom the medium probably has seen), tell us where the plunder lies hidden in a corner of Fagan's den? Why will no spirit, out of all the mighty and omniscient host, inform his friend and patron on earth in what precise "slum" Mr. Sykes still lingers in inglorious idleness until the atmosphere cools down? Probably for the very same reason which prevents, and will continue to prevent, all clairvoyants from deciphering the number of the note for 50,000 francs which vainly waits, and will for ever wait, their scrutiny and detection in Paris at this very time. Otherwise, that note would long since have been snapped up by some needy adventurer, biologist, medium, or spiritualist.

And yet, in spite of all this damning evidence, the lie is believed. It is believed by thousands who themselves look down with bland satisfaction not only on the *gaucherie* of Hodge in the wilderness, but on the credulity of poor Mary Jane the servant-girl who stands in awe of "the seventh daughter of a seventh daughter," and bribes the gipsy-woman at the area-gate with seven shillings and sixpence and a good shawl "to break the spell." And as for Mary Jane's mistress, she, according to recent daily-papers, is little better. She gives this same wretched impostor, the gipsy-woman, a crown piece to make up a bottle of brown mixture which shall "do her husband good," and yet take him away from that house entirely. This is openly avowed before the magistrate. The event took place not in the slums of Whitechapel, not in the godless precincts of Snow-hill, but in the sanctified domains of Clapham, under the very noses of the enlightened. Who then can be safe?

From Hodge up to the refinement, the intellectual spiritualism of fashionable life, the same one error prevails. The form varies, but the poison remains as noxious and as full of death in the one case as the other. The secret root of half the mischief is a positive want of faith in that unseen Being who rules the universe. It is a denial on the part of Christians even of that old Pagan's doctrine groping after the truth:—

"Quicquid patimur, mortale genus
Quicquid facimus, venit ex alto."

Thousands are ignorant of, slow to believe in, or ready

to deny, this guiding power because unseen, and are yet ready to believe in the first wandering impostor who dares to offer them a glimpse across that border-line which God has concealed. To gain this glimpse they seem ready to forfeit all claim to self-respect, to give themselves up to the blind guidance of the first ignorant knave with impudence enough to claim a power never given to man, who, while he preys upon the living, is not ashamed or afraid to seek to violate the repose of the dead; who pretends to summon to his presence spirits of omniscience that respond to his call in words that set at defiance all decency, orthography, and common sense.

The Royal Supremacy the True Defence of the Liberties of the Church.



HERE is hardly anything about which more mistaken notions prevail than about the true intent and meaning of the Royal Supremacy. It is a common idea that Henry VIII, being a king of an arbitrary temper, determined to make himself supreme in matters of religion, and to appropriate to himself the spiritual supremacy which had belonged to the Pope; and, in accordance with this theory, it is now commonly assumed that the Church of England is subject to the State, *i.e.* nominally to the Queen, in all spiritual matters. If this be the opinion prevalent amongst ourselves, it is little wonderful that foreigners, and ultramontane Romanists especially, should carry the notion even further, and should refuse to so much as entertain the question of the true position of our Church. And it is not difficult to see what sort of an effect the prevalence of such opinions is calculated to have upon the Church itself. It is probable that two-thirds of our legislators in either House of Parliament have never thought of any other system. They assume that they have power and right to make laws for the Church of England, as much as for the State. And so, no sense is entertained of the impropriety of discussing religious questions, and settling even doctrinal matters, in such an assembly. This was conspicuously the case in the debates about the matter of divorce. Parliament seemed to be not even aware of the solecism of altering or affecting to alter the doctrine of the Church on one of the most difficult questions of Divine law, without the slightest reference to what might be the judgment of divines upon the subject.

But there is another class of legislators to whom this inconsistency is sufficiently apparent, and who rejoice in it. The Romanist seems to himself to view herein the practical result of that "Submission of the clergy" against which he protests. The Nonconformist equally regards it as a thralldom intolerable to the conscience, from which he is exempt. And these two parties, agreeing in nothing else, are combined in their efforts to overthrow such an "establishment." And they are each backed by a large number of adherents out of doors, while an indistinct sense of something not quite defensible, but which may be tolerated for the sake of a greater good, hampers the proceedings even of those who call themselves the "*friends* (!) of the Church."

This name, indeed, would be almost ludicrous if men could be got to view the matter in its true light. "Friends" of what? Sinners saved by the free mercy of God, and chosen by His pitying grace *into* that great Society, His Church, which He has purchased by His blood, in order that each therein may win the crown which He has given him—What sort of a notion is it in that man's mind who thinks he can *patronise* the Society of which he ought to be conscious that he himself is but a most unworthy member, and in and through which are all his hopes of happiness or peace?

But let that pass. The fact is, we are at cross purposes when we talk so. Such men's notions relate to an institution with tithes and glebes and parsons; kept up for

"teaching the people." Our notion is of a Divine Society of which we all are members.

The question, however, which we desire to discuss is whether this common idea of the condition of the Church of England since the Reformation is the true notion, and whether there be not some higher and truer view of what was intended, and of what ought in fact to be attempted.

And first, it is remarkable, as a matter of historical fact, that the Royal Supremacy when first formally introduced, or, as some say, restored, was almost universally popular. It was defended and justified not by Cranmer only and his party, but by Gardiner and Bonner, both of whom wrote in favour of it; and Gardiner declared, in reply to Cardinal Pole, that if the king were so disposed he would find it a difficult thing to get the people to consent to its repeal. Indeed, it seems to be on this account that the latest historian of these times, Mr. Froude, has amused himself with calling Gardiner "The chief of the Anglo-catholic party." Gardiner had, indeed, a notion of the Royal Supremacy, much like that of his master, by which the Church should retain the doctrines of the mediæval Church, but be independent of the supremacy of the Pope. It followed, as might have been foreseen, that the Church, when freed from Papal influence, would seek to return also to a more primitive system of doctrine. But subject to this most important distinction, it is the fact that Gardiner appreciated the then prevailing idea of the Royal Supremacy, as the Defence of the Liberties of the Church, no less than Cranmer, who, at least in his own times, had the credit of having discovered or restored it. The difference was that Cranmer, as a man of piety and a learned divine, was desirous of recovering therewith primitive doctrine also, and so was at the head of the Reforming Party, while Gardiner, being more of a statesman than of a divine, was naturally repelled towards the reactionary party when he saw the point to which the movement was tending. His famous saying, intended probably for Cranmer, "that some would go on reforming till they had nothing old left them but their folly," illustrates the difference in the character of the man.

The principle, therefore, which we desire to maintain is this; that the original notion and design of the Royal Supremacy was as a counterpoise to the encroachments of Rome, and a defence of the true liberties and independence of the National Church against foreign interference and jurisdiction.

How great had been that tyranny which the Papal Court had for ages exercised over the Church and realm of England is matter of history, and is attested in the many remonstrances against it which exist in our earlier statutes. The Council of Clarendon, the Statutes of *Præmunire* and *Provisors*, and many others, were directed to this end. But they had all been found insufficient, and why? Because the clergy were still bound by their oaths to obey the Pope in all spiritual matters, and possessing also by law the power to make their own canons, irrespective of the Crown, they were compelled by the Papal Court to enact the Papal laws, and thus to give them currency in England.

Take an example of this in the case of transubstantiation. It is well known that this doctrine was not formally received by any Council of the Church, until that of the Fourth Lateran under Innocent III, A.D. 1216. But it is equally well known that, in order to give currency to the decrees of a general council, (which that professed, though improperly, to be,) it is also required that its decrees should be formally accepted, and this had not been done in England except by one or two diocesan synods, until the time of Wycliffe, in order to whose condemnation it seems to have been found necessary that the Provincial Synod of Canterbury should first promulgate the doctrine, before they could proceed by law to condemn the reformer for rejecting it, which condemnation they were commanded by the Pope to pass. It was obviously in vain that efforts were made by Church or State at regaining liberty and independent action in matters of religion so long as this state of things remained.

Or take another instance, not indeed of legislation, but

no less clearly affecting the liberties of the Church,—the case of the election of bishops. It is certain that from the earliest times, in England as elsewhere, cathedral chapters have had a voice in the election of bishops. And yet it is no less certain that from the earliest times, in the Anglosaxon no less than the Norman reigns, our kings have claimed and exercised the right of nominating those whom they should recommend to the chapters for election. The very ground of this claim is expressed by Edward I. in the famous statute of *Provisors*, when his object was to rescue the Church from that paramount influence of the Pope, which he had contrived to engraft upon the liberties guaranteed by *Magna Charta*. It is declared by *Magna Charta* that the Church shall enjoy her liberty in elections. But when the interference of the King was thus for a while removed, the only consequence seems to have been that the Pope availed himself of such liberty to subject the Church still more to himself by compelling the chapters to elect *his own* nominees. Against this our great legislator endeavoured to provide, by declaring that the liberties of *Magna Charta* were not intended to destroy the ancient rights of the Crown, and that the kings of England possessed the right to be consulted in the election, as having themselves "founded the Church in the estate of prelacy." But this law was but of small avail so long as the clergy owned the superior authority of the Pope in spiritual matters: and so the King was fain to compound with the Pope, and the voice of the chapter was already reduced to a mere form before the law of Henry VIII. was passed, obliging them, under pain of a *præmunire*, to elect the nominee of the Crown. The object of this law clearly was to break the power of the Pope. It was in vain that the King nominated while the chapters might be coerced by the Pope into the rejection of his nominee, and the only effectual way to liberate them from this thralldom was to compel them, at least for the time, to accept the nominee of the Crown.

At least for the time—for such a law seems in its very nature to be designed to be only temporary, and this view, which had been before propounded, has also been taken by Mr. Froude. But we have now another and a further ground for contending that the Church should be restored to its Anglosaxon liberty, not by depriving the Crown of its right to nominate, but by abolishing that harsh and temporary enactment which deprives the chapter of all power in withstanding an unjust nomination. We allude to the fact of the Pope having now of late pretended to abolish the Church of England, to sweep away Canterbury and all its suffragans from the map of Christendom, and to supply their places by his so-called Archbishopric of Westminster and its subject sees. From that time the very purpose for which the *præmunire* was introduced into our episcopal elections has ceased to exist. The Pope cannot, if he would, interfere in our elections, because he has affected, as far as in him lies, to abolish all the sees in which it is even possible that his interference could affect us. Thus it may be that the good providence of God may bring good out of evil, and be the means of restoring our Church, in this respect, altogether to her ancient liberties. It is to be observed that, in form at least, these elections are still the same as they have always been. It only requires that the temporary enactment be repealed, and then we could not find either a better or a more constitutional way of appointing our Bishops, than for the Crown to nominate, yet subject only to such power of rejection, in extreme cases, by the chapter, as would serve to make the advisers of the Crown circumspect in their choice.

In these two cases, then, of imposing doctrine and of episcopal election the Royal Supremacy came in aid of the restoration of the liberties of the Church. Nor would they ever have been recovered by any other means, except by a total subversion of the Church, as in other countries.

But how in regard to other matters, and especially those which relate to the enunciation and the trial of doctrine. We have seen how it was under Papal supremacy. The Papal theory was, and is, that the clergy are the Church; that they alone have the right not to teach only, but to

settle all points of doctrine; and so long as the clergy possessed the power of enacting their own canons, irrespective of the Crown or Parliament, it followed that the clergy being subject to the Pope, the Pope could dictate his own laws to every Christian nation.

It was given to England, in the providence of God, to be the first to break this yoke, and it was done by means of the Royal Supremacy. This is the meaning of that seemingly strange expression in the Act of Henry VIII. which declares that this realm of England "*is an empire,*" &c. Taken alone, and apart from the circumstances, it might be thought that this was merely some flight of Henry's vanity, affecting to place his kingdom on a footing of equality with his great rival Charles V. But it is no such thing; nor was Henry, with all his faults, a man of so poor a spirit. The words enunciate a great constitutional doctrine, which the king was resolved to enforce. And it is a doctrine that applies to all independent countries, under whatever form of government they may be. There is an inherent right in all independent nations to make their own laws, without any interference of any foreign authority, either in religion or politics. And this supremacy, inherent in all separate states, is vested in the Crown, as the ultimate source of all law, in monarchical countries, while in other countries it vests, or ought to vest, in that authority, whatever it may be, which exercises the supreme power in the State. In the present divided state of Christendom this truth is obscured. In the great Transatlantic Republic every separate community of Christians regulates its own affairs, but it regulates them subject alike to the supervision and the protection of the State, and not without the concurrence of the general body of its members. In such cases, this concurrence stands in the place of legislative sanction, the legislature itself merely confirming the community thus associated, in the possession of its property and the exercise of its functions. But in our old Anglosaxon Witenagemot the true nature of the case was more clearly seen, where matters of religion were not conducted without the presence and assent of the spirituality, nor by them without the sanction of the king and great men of the country.

It was something of this kind which was partially recovered, and in theory restored, by our Royal Supremacy, and it is this, therefore, which we ought to bear in mind in any attempt to accommodate our existing circumstances to our existing position in regard to Church and State.

The divided state of Christendom tends, indeed, still to obscure this truth. The Anglican community cannot pretend to enunciate the faith in the sense in which it is enunciated by a general council of the individual Church. We can but "take care of our own Church in our own provincial councils," as Bishop Jewel expressed it, and lay down what we believe to be most near to the primitive and true belief of Christendom, subject to our appeal to such free general council when it may be had.

And this belief enunciated by the spirituality becomes the faith of our branch of the Church when it has been adopted by the laity in Parliament, and ratified by the Crown, not so as to claim that it is infallibly true, but so as that we have received to hold and teach it. For it is most clearly laid down, in our Reformation statutes, that the spirituality is one part of our constitution, and the commonalty another; and that the spirituality is competent to judge of such matters, and has a right to be consulted.

It will probably be seen hereafter, much more than is now perceived, that this was the one great object for which those contended who laboured, at length successfully, for the revival of Convocation. It was not merely the question of giving advice to the Bishops or the Parliament, still less was it the desire to hear their own voices uttered in their own assemblies, by which the men were actuated who carried that great effort to a successful issue. There was a much higher principle at stake, that principle being whether the Royal Supremacy itself should become a tyranny instead of a protection, if the voice of the spirituality were suppressed, and the Church were governed merely by a parliament of laymen, no longer confined to members of its own communion.

Even so there are many and grave questions behind, to which we may perhaps hereafter return, especially in connection with the two points, how to accommodate such a notion of Royal Supremacy as we have here delineated to the present condition of our Parliamentary constitution, and how to regulate the trial of doctrine so as to combine the due influence of the spirituality in spiritual things with that just supremacy of law which attaches to all cases where faith is regulated by law.

But, in confirmation of the view here taken, we would call attention, in conclusion, to the state of things in other countries, and in France especially, with which the authors of our system of Royal Supremacy were familiar. What were "Gallican liberties," but another phase of Royal Supremacy as viewed from another point of view? In the one aspect, it is the Crown protecting the Church against the encroachment of a foreign power; in the other, it is the Church restored to her liberty under the protection of the Crown. In proof of this, it is even now the custom of the ultramontane party to decry Gallican liberties under the opprobrious term of Gallican slavery. And this may be a lesson to ourselves. Under a sense of the excesses to which Royal Supremacy has been carried, while the just voice of the spirituality was suppressed, men have learned to regard it as a tyranny, and writhe under it as an intolerable yoke. Be it ours rather to point to its better and higher purpose, and to show what good service it has done towards preserving the liberties of our Church, and how we may restore it to its high and original purpose.

Church and State in America.



WHILE devoting our constant energies to the maintenance of the legal connection between Church and State in this country, it will be instructive to glance now and then at the condition of things in our kindred nation on the other side of the Atlantic, as well as in our own colonies. We shall thus see the disadvantages against which the Church has to contend where no such connection exists, and learn to prize more highly our own time-honoured Constitution. We shall perceive also, in the clearest manner, the vitality of the Church, when thrown merely upon her divine and spiritual powers, and with no legal superiority over any sect or schism that may be spawned upon the world by fanaticism or knavery. And we shall thus feel only the more strongly why it is that in our own Constitutional formula of "Church and State" the CHURCH is placed first, as it always has been, and always ought to be, in the heart of every true Catholic Christian.

In the Revolutionary war we reaped the fruits of our own unprincipled blunders in the colonial policy which we had obstinately pursued ever since the settlements in America began. At the close of that war the religious condition of that country was deplorable in the extreme. In the principal Southern Colonies, where the Church had been to a certain extent established and endowed with glebes and income during the Colonial period, the substance of Church frame-work was almost entirely rotted away. *Ecclesia est in Episcopo*: and as there had never been a Bishop sent over to America, it is hard for us to conceive the depth of deadness to which an Episcopal Church without Bishops had run down in the hundred and fifty years during which our time-serving Home Government forced our American brethren to try the experiment. Within a few years after the war was over the Church was utterly plundered and peeled. In Virginia, where the Colonial Church was the strongest, every vestige of State support was withdrawn, and soon all the glebes and other Church property were confiscated. The remnant of Church clergy and laity dwindled year by year. A suit at law was instituted to test the constitutionality of the Act of Legislature confiscating the glebes, and on appeal, the sudden death of one of the judges, on the very night

before the decision of the Court was to be rendered, and after his opinion in favour of the Church was fully written out, left the Court equally divided, and the appeal was not sustained. There was not courage enough left, nor could money be raised to carry the case to the Supreme Court of the United States: and so completely was the Church beaten down to the very earth that the Bishop of Virginia confined himself for the rest of his life almost wholly to his duties as President of William and Mary College; the annual Conventions of the Diocese ceased to be held from 1805 to 1812; and on the election of a new bishop, after Bishop Madison's death, only seven clergymen attended.

Moreover, the reaction from Church mismanagement during Colonial times was by no means confined to things temporal. As the absence of all proper Episcopal discipline had made the Church Colonies, and Virginia especially, the last resort of clergymen who were too incompetent or of too bad a character to get a living at home, the reputation of the Church for earnestness and the power of godliness was at the lowest point among the community generally. As Church strength began to wane, Baptists and Presbyterians swarmed, with an activity and eagerness which could be satisfied with nothing short of the total destruction of that which they had so long feared and envied as well as hated. For awhile, the Methodists claimed to be Churchmen, and took the part of the Church in these contests, preserving for her, in her decay, the only odour of sanctity that remained: but when their spurious Wesleyan Episcopacy was started, they, too, turned against the miserable rump of the Church that was left; and even hope seemed to be dead. There were still Church families, indeed: but they were such mainly because it was the gentlemanly thing to be what their ancestors had been before them. Their lives were, for the most part, utterly worldly and careless; and their sentiments deeply tinged with French infidelity. But the darkest night precedes the morning. There has been a revival of the Church there since 1812; and now, at last, after the lapse of nearly ninety years, the number of the clergy is about as great as before the Revolution broke out. But the old blight seems to work itself out in another way: for in that Diocese, once the strongest Church colony, there has been, and still is, less of the true Church spirit than in any other part of America. The number of parishes in which no surplice is used, and the Ante-Communion service is habitually omitted, and the altar is used in time of divine worship as a convenient stand for the hat and umbrella of the officiating minister or *Bishop* (for this was a common custom with the late Bishop Meade), and where fraternal interchange of "pulpit exercises" with the Dissenters has been considered the proper thing for a clergyman who has been "truly regenerated,"—in all these things Virginia has long stood unhappily pre-eminent, and can be approached by no other Diocese in the land. The great effort seems to have been to convince the outsiders that, so far as "vital piety" was concerned, Churchmen could be as pious as they were, and with a piety of precisely the same flavour that was fashionable among the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists themselves. And in that effort they have at length succeeded. The property question has been left undisturbed; but the depth of the mark made by the old quarrel may be estimated from the fact that to this day the laws of Virginia forbid any endowment of any Church or Ecclesiastical institution of any sort, even by private munificence, to an amount exceeding 4,000*l*. The endowments of Alexandria Seminary, exceeding that amount, stand in the name of private persons, who might embezzle the whole without the possibility of any legal remedy.

With the Church reduced to this condition in the leading Church colony, it may easily be imagined how it was elsewhere. In South Carolina there were left but three clergymen, and the Church in that State only consented to join the General Convention on the express condition that no bishop should be sent to preside over them; in Georgia there was nothing; in North Carolina, nothing

—or next to nothing; in Maryland, eighteen or twenty clergy; in Pennsylvania only six; in New York, five; in Connecticut, ten; in all the rest of New England not more than six or seven. With this drop in the bucket, among a population of over three millions, the Church in America was weaker than it is now in Scotland, while the popular prejudice under which it laboured was even stronger. That it should influence the legislation of the State, then, for good, was simply impossible.

Nor was any one of the sects in a position to do what was thus manifestly impossible for the Church. Congregationalists were dominant in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire; Baptists in Rhode Island. Quakers were strong in Pennsylvania; Romanists in Maryland; Dutch Reformed in New York; Presbyterians in New Jersey, as well as in New York, Virginia, and further South; and Baptists and Methodists rapidly spreading through all the States except New England. No one of them all sufficiently preponderated over the rest to give any colour whatever to a claim to be established as the State Religion. They therefore made a virtue of necessity: and assumed it to be the highest perfection of the best possible system of earthly government that it should ignore entirely that element of Religion without which no system of free government is anything better than a house built upon the sand. There is not the slightest recognition of anything of the sort in the far-famed Constitution of the United States, except that it provides for certain "oaths" to be taken on assuming the exercise of certain offices: but the oath thus provided for is of a very vague description. The President of the United States, at his inauguration, must say—"I do solemnly swear"—but he does not say by what or by Whom he swears. He does not say, "So help me God:" for that would be more than Atheists believe: and an Atheist is as eligible to the office as any other native citizen who is thirty years old. The Christianity which is so carefully excluded in the document itself, however, reappears in the dating of it, which runs in the usual Christian formula,—"*In the year of OUR LORD*:"—but doubtless it was an oversight.

This is the logical, and ultimately necessary result, of discarding, on principle, all connection between Church and State, when the severance is brought about by defrauding the Church of her rights first, and then betraying her, shorn and blinded, into the hands of her enemies.

Hymnology.



THE title prefixed to this article is in its novelty a witness of the rise amongst us of a new department of literature, having its own distinct principles and aims—

"Indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum."

We have, of course, always had hymns and hymn writers; but the sacred lyrics of our great poets have seldom been found adapted for congregational use; whilst the attempts of religious writers to meet the deficiency have left us a large amount of rhyme, in which, for the most part, there is as little poetry as theology. The fact probably is that in this, as in other things, the supply has been regulated by the demand; and although the acuteness of Wesley at once perceived the importance of a hymn-book as a nucleus of religious thought and teaching, and the example set by him in providing a compilation of hymns embodying the familiarities of his system has been followed by others, yet the public mind in general has not felt the want, nor accepted heartily the efforts made to supply it. We can all remember when the use of a hymn-book was considered the badge of a party, a sure sign of unorthodox principles. The restoration of churches and the ejection of hymn-books went hand in hand together; and anthems were admissible; but where these were impracticable, Tait and Brady were recognized as the alone orthodox

medium of praise. The few hymns which in some incomprehensible manner have been appended to the metrical versions of the Psalms might be used; and many can recollect the increased interest which even then was felt when the recurrence of Easter or Christmas gave the signal for turning to the special hymns assigned to these festivals. Yet, those who confessed the pleasure derived from this meagre collection shrunk from the notion of enlarging it. All this is changed. High Church and Low Church are now at one upon this point. The last-mentioned school have indeed had a great triumph here, for they have seen their opponents, after declaiming against their use of unauthorized selections of hymns, rivalling them in the number and variety of their own compilations. But indeed the subject is, and has been felt to be, one of too important a character to be made the boast of a party triumph. It is impossible to overrate the importance of the "hymn" as a means of religious teaching. Wesley's hymnal has done more than his preaching to perpetuate his doctrine. It is not only that the hymn-book is a manual of instruction, it is also a bond of union. Here perhaps is to be found the philosophy of the rubric, which permits the chanting of the creeds of the church. It was felt that the doctrines of Christianity would obtain a firmer hold upon the mind if they were summed up not so much in *Articles* to be *subscribed*, as in hymns to be sung.

We have a few observations to offer upon this subject, which is in our judgment of vast importance. And first we would say a word upon the multiplicity of hymn-books now in use. We do not regard this as an unmixed evil. The objections made to it on the score of the uncertainty as to what hymns will be sung at any given church, and the consequent inconvenience to strangers are, we think, more plausible than real. Nearly every cathedral possesses a different collection of anthems, and the congregation at a cathedral is perhaps more variable than in any other church; but although it is of course as desirable to be able to follow the words of the anthem as of the hymn, we have never heard it proposed to forbid the continual introduction of new anthems for the sake of uniformity. At any rate the inconvenience complained of might be to a great extent removed by the simple precaution of leaving a moderate number of copies in the charge of the sexton or pew-openers, to be lent to any strangers who might be present. We are indeed disposed to argue that a diversity of hymn-books is not without its advantage. In a large National Church there will always exist a variety of thought and feeling upon many points of Christian faith and practice. It would be an evil day which should see the effort made to compress all into one uniform type. A certain measure of agreement is essential, but it cannot be pushed with safety beyond a fair limit. Uniformity carried to excess is a sign, not of health, but of disease. It can only be so enforced in a body where independence of thought is crushed by authority or prevented by general apathy and indifference. Assuming, then, that in a Church where vitality is vigorous there will always be found sundry modes of expressing feelings and opinions radically the same, we look upon the hymn-book as a safety-valve by which different schools may give utterance to their own peculiar tone of thought, and we do not wish the liberty to be restricted. It is further to be considered, by those who are anxious for one national hymnal, whether there is any practicable mode of obtaining it, which is not sure to end in the dissatisfaction of all parties. Any hymnal set forth by authority must be a compromise; and when every school of theology at present included within the pale of the National Church had eliminated the verses and phrases which might be obnoxious to itself, what would be left but a cold and vapid residuum, expressing heartily the mind of none, and therefore only just tolerated by all.

Recurring to the hymn-books in general use, we find them to consist of what is in fact the title of one collection, "Hymns ancient and modern." With regard to modern hymns, we have heard doubts raised as to the legitimacy of adopting into the Church Service the composi-

tions of Dissenters. We have no sympathy with this scruple, and are very glad to find the more liberal spirit generally prevailing. However much we deplore the evils of a broken unity, we cannot deny the existence of a high degree of piety and learning in many Nonconformists both of the present and a former age. Nor can we see any reason why the Church should not thankfully avail itself of their labours. If the censers of even Korah and his company were to be converted into broad plates for the covering of the altar, it must we think be a very narrow fanaticism which would regard as unworthy of our sanctuaries the contributions made to God's worship by men whose individual piety none can gainsay, whatever may be urged as to the untenable character of their ecclesiastical position.

With regard to ancient hymns, we may pursue one of two courses. We may *translate* them, or we may take them as a foundation of new compositions. Now, we believe that if the old songs of the Church are ever to become popular, it will be through the latter process. It is rarely that any translation preserves the freedom and vigour of the original, you get *verses*, not *poetry*, when you translate. We would suggest also that many of the Latin hymns are, as they stand, disqualified for modern use by the archaism not so much of the language as of the thought. The fact is that they were not written for the use of a general congregation, but for clerks and religious communities. Even at the time when they were composed many of the allusions could have been appreciated only by a few. Translate, therefore, as cleverly as you will, it will still be found requisite to modify and to omit, in order to present the hymn in a shape fit for the use of a modern parochial congregation. But while this is undoubtedly the case, and whilst for this and other reasons we hold that translations of Latin hymns will generally fail to win the sympathies of the people, yet we conceive that a vast majority of those old strains, in which are gathered up the devout aspirations of centuries, afford a noble basis upon which to construct spiritual songs, which, whilst not wholly losing their link with the dead, shall thoroughly carry along with them the hearts of the living. The ancient hymns are especially rich in the expression of the objective verities of Christianity, the very point in which the modern hymn is for the most part defective. On this ground alone we should desire to see in any compilation a good proportion of hymns founded upon the ancient; but we protest against a slavish adherence to the original: such an adherence can, we are persuaded, give us neither a vigorous poem nor a useful hymn.

Poverty of the Clergy.



POORLY-AGED men will doubtless well remember the agitation stirred in the public mind a quarter of a century since by multiplied representations and misrepresentations of clerical wealth and cupidity. The riches of the Church at that juncture formed the staple of the town's gossip: they were criticised mercilessly by the press: they pointed the mob-orator's tale: they furnished political capital for parliamentary demagogues. Relentless enemies printed and circulated a *Black Book*, professing to give startling revelations of ministerial greed, and with a view, no doubt, to precipitate the confiscation of ecclesiastical property. The nepotism of bishops, and the jobberies of cathedral dignitaries, and the accumulated savings of pluralists, were rated and over-rated, discussed and exaggerated, with the usual proportion of some truth and much falsehood, in every circle and through every channel, until, to the apprehension of many, the days of the National Church Establishment were numbered.

Thirty years have passed away, and the same topic, ecclesiastical finance, still attracts public attention, but from a precisely opposite point of view. It is no longer

the *affluence*, but the *poverty* of the clergy which weighs upon the mind, and evokes the sympathies, of the nation. It is one of the recognized social problems of the day. How is the ministry of the Church to be supported? How are the hungry claims of spiritual destitution to be confronted? How are funds to be provided for the long-expected augmentation of the episcopate? How are the incomes of deaneries to be adjusted, so that they shall not be virtually removed from the reach of men without private fortunes? How are rectors and vicars to bear the strain upon their narrow means of a Dilapidation Bill? or to enlarge the stipends of their curates? How are curates to live? How *do* they live? How do they pay their Christmas bills, or keep a decent coat upon their backs? Such as these are the anxious questions of the time, and the causes of this revulsion of feeling are obvious.

Between the years 1835 and 1840 were passed those several Acts of Parliament which limited episcopal incomes, restricted episcopal translation, commuted tithes for rent-charge, called the clergy into residence, provided for the extinction of pluralities, reorganized, whether for good or evil, the whole cathedral system, and, with a due regard to vested interests, may be said to have begun, if not to have completed, the great fiscal reformation of the Reformed Church.

The object of these enactments was to remove existing scandals; and we have lived to see—so time steals on—the wisdom of their authors thus far at least justified, that their most sanguine anticipations are on the verge of an absolute fulfilment. A bishop may still seem to have an ample rent-roll, but we suspect that, when all the demands ever recurring, and all the deductions upon it ever increasing, are calculated, the margin of profit will be small enough. Deans and canons are notoriously unable to live in their residentiary houses, and to support the conventional hospitalities of their condition, without some extraneous or additional sources of revenue. The country parsons may not be men of business, but they must be wonderful domestic managers to maintain the proprieties of their position, to meet the tax-gatherer and the overseer and the surveyor with a ready cheque, to satisfy the many calls upon their charity, and to bring up their proverbially large families even upon the four or five hundred a-year which are accounted the windfalls of their profession. The town parsons are, as a class, about the worst-paid functionaries in the land; and every heart is said to bleed for the poor curates, although, if we may judge from the balance-sheets of the societies instituted to aid and supply them, the sympathy largely evaporates in sentiment.

But it is not by legislative interference alone that the poverty of the clergy has become an accomplished fact. The population of the country has been increasing of late at the rate of 250,000 per annum. Every unit in this sum has a soul to be saved, and a new race of clergy, with new districts, new parishes, new churches, new schools, has been lavishly called into existence to meet the exigency. But “who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?” To the liberal old endowments of the Church local and occasional additions have of necessity been made, but with such a careful regard to economy, that they can hardly be regarded as more than shifts and expedients to set the new machinery in motion. The milk is in no proportion to the flock. The elder has no “double honour;”

“*Si dives pecoris, nivei non lactis abundans.*”

In 1835 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners reported 3,629 benefices in England and Wales with incomes under 150*l.* Of these 377 were under 50*l.* But since that date there have been created 2,000 fresh cures, with churches to be regularly served, and incomes still ranging from 50*l.* to 150*l.* We have 4,000 assistant curates, with stipends seldom reaching, never exceeding, the latter sum: so that we have a total of something like 10,000 clergymen earning from one to not quite three pounds per week, and many of them

subject to the extraordinary direct taxation under which their profession suffers, beyond all others in the land, simply because their receipts are from a lien on real property.

Now, it is no answer to this statement to say that it has given birth to much exaggeration. We can quite admit that the appeals to our compassion are often overcharged: that the “startling facts,” if true in themselves, yet will often convey a false impression from the omission of circumstances which might serve to qualify and explain them. We know that there must in every vocation be a vast amount of individual suffering resulting from incapacity, or indolence, or improvidence, or vice; and that too frequently the case of clerical destitution, paraded in some public print, which taps the springs of indiscriminate benevolence, and suddenly enriches the astonished insolvent, is referable to one of these causes. But, notwithstanding, the fact remains, as we have represented it—there are 10,000 men, most of them well-born and highly educated; with rare exceptions earnest, honest, pains-taking, devoted servants of Jesus Christ, doing their allotted work quietly and without ostentation; faithful to the discharge of their ordination vows, giving all their time and their thoughts to the diligent observance of duty—most of them in retired nooks and corners of the land—in their ancient village sanctuaries, in the cottages of their poor, by the bedside of the sick and dying, in their schools by day and by *night*, in all the varied employments of their sacred mission, making full proof of their ministry—and for these services, illimitable in aim, incalculable in consequences, only just maintained, if maintained at all, above starvation point.

The effect of such a condition of things would naturally be to check the supply of well-qualified men for Holy Orders; and to this issue we have actually come. It is a frightful contingency to contemplate; but from this and other causes the supply of clergy is not equal to the demand; the *quantum* and the *qualis* are both in defect: the bishops are even now unable to maintain the salutary restrictions imposed from time immemorial upon the candidates: not the University test only, but even that of the Theological College, it is every year more difficult to insist upon. Examining chaplains tell us that the standard of proficiency is rather declining than otherwise, and in the dearth of curates it becomes a grave responsibility for any cause short of moral or physical unfitness to refuse those who willingly offer themselves. If any ask for a sign, no greater sign can be given them than this—parents will not bring up their sons to the work; and of Oxford especially it is commonly asserted, that the preparation for Holy Orders is now regarded—in that ancient nursery of the Church—as something ultra-chivalrous, quixotic, obsolete.

Such is the disorder: and many a thoughtful mind is anxiously seeking to devise the remedies. Of these the first which commends itself to the traditional instincts of an Englishman is the aid and operation of societies. The religious society is the religious Englishman's great resource. It is the element in which he lives and moves and works for his Master's kingdom. And it cannot be said that societies are wanting for the relief of the present distress. Some there are confined in their agency to the support of widows and orphans. Others, again, apply themselves zealously to the wants of poor acting and superannuated clergymen. There are, especially, two institutions, of comparatively recent origin, representing the two schools of divinity in the Church, chartered for the single purpose of supplementing the efforts of incumbents to provide curates for populous and poorly-endowed parishes. But all the united instrumentality of these charitable guilds of almoners falls far short of the desired object. They act usefully as palliatives, but do not reach the root of the disease.

The next suggestion, therefore, is that an herculean effort shall be made to raise the required funds by boldly putting forth the doctrine, that no sincere Christian can give less than a tenth of his revenue to God: that the Divine exhortation, “Ye have robbed Me . . . in tithes and offerings,” shall be pressed upon the conviction of the

nation. This is the gist of Mr. Ramsbotham's published *Letter to a Colonial Bishop*, of which the appendix is particularly interesting. This is the principle which underlies Mr. Markland's valuable argument for the Offertory. This shapes the vision which Mr. Jervis conjures up—to cheer and to encourage the hearts of the Cambridge Church Congress—of the redemption of alienated tithes, and of a colossal Church Endowment Society to overspread the land, to be “a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat.”

We have great respect for Mr. Jervis. He has done his poor brethren good service, and if he could only carry out a portion of his benevolent schemes, the “good day” would soon be upon us. He thinks it not impossible that we may yet live to see the grey cloisters of Tintern, and the sculptured aisles of Fountains Abbey re-occupied and re-paced by holy men of God, aged and worn-out servants of the Church, who should there be gathered, as into a common home, and close their troublous days in peace, and mingle their dust with that of the saintly fathers of olden time. But he has more practical proposals to advance than this. He argues that if the revenues derived from Queen Anne's Bounty, added to the Parliamentary grants made in favour of the National Establishment since 1809, had been applied to the redemption of tithes, seeing that tithes can be bought at twenty-five years' purchase, all the misappropriation of sacred property, over which we make our lament, might ere this have been recovered for the original owners: and, pointing to the success of certain local Church Endowment Associations, he urges that even now it is quite feasible by hearty, vigorous, and united action, slowly perhaps, but surely, to retrieve the losses and disasters of the past.

It is well, at all events, that all such imaginations, even the most airy and fanciful, should take a bodily shape, and be presented to the public view. Much every way is to be gained by free ventilation and full discussion of the subject. There are thousands, both of clergy and laity, ready at this moment to respond to any well-considered appeal. Convocation has taken the question of “inadequate endowments” into its most careful consideration; and it is hardly credible that the people of this rich country will long endure the scandal and the stigma of being themselves taught in the Word, and yet refusing to minister to them that teach in all good and necessary things.

The Scottish Communion Office.

BOTH friends and foes will admit that the contemplated abolition of the National Communion Office of the Church of Scotland is a very serious and a very radical change; a change, therefore, that ought not to be made without good and sufficient reasons. The Office, as our readers are aware, has been more or less in use ever since the Church in the north was dis-established at the Revolution of 1688. It is founded on that which was drawn up by Archbishop Laud, though its present form, and the form that it has taken since its last revision, about 150 years ago, by the Scottish contemporaries of our English nonjurors, is more in accordance with the liturgies of the East. Its chief liturgical characteristic is that there is an invocation to the Holy Ghost to make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ after the recitation of the ordinary words of consecration, a feature common to other liturgies of the Catholic Church, but not found in that now known as the Roman. As regards its language generally, it is far richer and deeper, and more in accordance with the Office of the English Church, which may be found in King Edward the Sixth's first Prayer-book. It is also almost identical with the Communion Office of the American Church, which Bishops Seabury and White were the means of introducing, when, as first bishops of our communion, they were sent

to the Western Continent. It is also a distinct link between East and West. Three times has this Scottish Office been solemnly approved in Synod of the whole Scotch Church, and every prelate and clergyman holding office therein has been called upon to sign a canon in which, while the use of the English Office is permitted, the National Office is declared to be of “primary authority.” So that it is used at consecrations, ordinations, and general and diocesan Synods. Those of our readers who desire to become thoroughly acquainted with its distinguishing characteristics should obtain Dr. Neale's *Life of Bishop Torrey, of St. Andrew's*, which is a treatise upon the merits and scope of the National Communion Service by one of our most accomplished liturgical scholars of the present day.

It is this Office, then, that it is contemplated to abolish, and a special general Synod has been summoned mainly for this particular purpose, which will be held in July.

There are two sections of opponents to the Office. The first are those who evidently dislike its deep ecclesiastical teaching, of which the Dean of Edinburgh may be regarded as the leader, since he has quite recently elaborated an argument against it which needs no addition whatsoever to make it a categorical exposition of pure Zwinglianist (pp. 12, 13, *The Present Position of the Episcopal Church of Scotland*.) The second section consists of a small but active band who have very hastily jumped at the Bishop of Oxford's proposition that the Scotch Church should throw their National Office overboard before any demand is made to Parliament for the removal of certain civil disabilities under which the Scottish clergy suffer. Then there is the general Scottish public, which, being essentially Presbyterian, are ready to swell the cry of “Popery” against any system or service which carries on its forefront the unmistakable stamp of genuine antiquity and catholicity. So that our readers will easily imagine the great danger existing at the present crisis.

Some at least, however, of our northern brethren, both clerics and laymen, are alive to the difficulty, and have not hesitated to step forward boldly to prevent so radical and impolitic a change being effected as appears to be in contemplation. A layman, whose *appeal* has recently been issued and circulated by the Messrs. Blackwood, of Edinburgh, has many powerful arguments and earnest words. The following passage is so remarkably to the point that we venture to give it in its entirety:—

“I wish, as a man of the world, to press on your consideration, whether, in a worldly view, you are likely to promote the repeal of the disability by abandoning that Communion Office which you have hitherto declared of primary authority. If, as I believe, and great part of the Church believe, the Scottish Office and the English Office are virtually the same,—diversity of words and diversity of arrangement, yet teaching the same belief,—there seems no reason why the one Office should be of greater authority than the other. If it could be done without disturbing men's minds, I for one would rejoice to see perfect conformity between the Churches of England and Scotland, in ritual as in doctrine. But men's conscience rises with abhorrence at the proposition to enter on such questions with a bribe,—a miserable, mean, worldly bribe,—held up before us. I ask you, then, whether, if you attempt in present circumstances to throw over and disown what you have hitherto taught your people to look to as of primary authority, you do not so place yourselves and place your laity that you and they become objects of disrespect in the eyes of all thinking men?

“Is it likely that, after you have done the deed, you will obtain the price? Your fellow Bishops do not promise it. They have not the power of giving you relief, even if they were inclined. It is not from them the relief has to come. Even their consent is not necessary. It is to the Queen, Lords, and Commons, you have to look. They may grant things the Bishops refuse to grant. And do you think your communion will rise in the estimation of the noblemen and gentlemen of England, after the perpetration of so despicable an act? Do you think that our brethren, the English Dissenters, so consistent, so

uniform in the resistance of all encroachment on their liberties, civil and religious, will join hands with a communion which sells its birthright; buys its relief from oppression at the price of sacrifice of religious principle? No—no—no. We will not sink in the estimation of all good and all honourable men. Let us hold by the truth. Let us have no mixture of our secular with our holy things. Bend our neck to the oppressor so long as God permits the oppression to continue. But maintain the faith, not doubting.”—(Pp. 20, 21.)

We venture thus briefly to conclude, then, that there is no true and valid reason either for abolishing the Scottish Office, or for altering the position it at present occupies. To abolish it now would be to condemn those who gave it its original position,—the Rattrays, the Gadderers, the Jollys, and the Skinners of a former generation. To alter it would be to affirm that they held and taught that which was erroneous, and to declare that the whole Oriental Church has corrupted the faith. While to do so in the hope of obtaining some temporal advantage—such, for example, as the removal of the civil disabilities—would be to adopt a policy which all honest men would utterly repudiate and condemn. That the Church of England and the Church of Scotland are in full communion either with other is a patent fact which none can deny. The civil disabilities under which the clergy of the latter communion lie is a simple question for the legislature, and for the legislature alone, to consider. Let their removal be sought, therefore, in the proper way and from the proper quarter. The exact identity of Services has nothing whatever to do with the question. Nor ought the two distinct points ever to have been mixed up. Then as to the abolition of local influences in the Church, and the cutting off of national peculiarities, what is this but a carrying out of that dangerous principle of centralization which Rome has recently acted upon, and which Anglicans so generally and properly condemn? A dead uniformity in the types of worship is not unity. Nor is the destruction of local traditions and a contempt for national feelings a policy to be commended. The Church of Scotland has had its day of trial and persecution, and still lives. Her foes did their worst, but failed. The banner of the Cross is still floating and the ancient faith still retained. She was one and united when her foes were external to her. Let care be taken that in no haste or impetuosity—under the guidance of those who, may be, lack the calm judgment and sterling sagacity of her confessors of a past century—she discover her most cruel enemies to be those of her own household. Let not the constant sapping and mining of the present day effect that which the open assault of a former generation was utterly unable to accomplish.

Bigotry.

BIGOTRY is a name of exceeding bad odour, and is most commonly used as a stigma to brand the stern virtue of a jealous maintenance of unpopular opinions in religion. It is indeed by no means an easy matter to define the exact line of border land where the virtue so indicated passes from the golden mean of religious faith into either of the opposite vicious extremes of superstition and infidelity. Not that superstition is a convertible synonym of bigotry. We are not sure whether, according to the *norma loquendi* of ordinary usage, any one who simply stuck to his religious principles, be they what they may, and refused to surrender them on persuasion, with a mere passive doggedness, would be called a bigot. He might be so by the disappointed zealot who had failed to convert him. But we fancy that something like an obtrusive assertion of one's private judgment upon others, if not an active persecution of opponents, is generally considered necessary to provoke and justify the reproachful epithet. Dean Trench, in the early editions of his *Study of Words*, (though the suggestion was dropped

without notice, as if untenable, in the latter ones,) favours the derivation of the word from the Spanish *bigotes*, moustachios; the bearded Spaniard, with his moral atmosphere of inquisition and *auto-da-fés*, being a sort of standing vignette illustrative of religious persecution. Others have derived it, unreasonably, from the least bigoted of religionists, the Beguines, *Latini* Beguttæ. Others, with more ingenuity, from the Anglo-Norman pronunciation of a national oath passing into a nickname; an opprobrium of which their descendants at this day travelling on the Continent have been deemed not altogether undeserving. A friend, standing at our elbow as we write, jocosely suggests that a “bigoted man” is simply a Cymric or Gaelic corruption of a “pig-headed man;” and his etymology, perhaps, as we shall presently show, comes nearest to the true idea so signified. Lastly, the good lady chronicled by *Punch* who bought her *bigotry* at Storr and Mortimer's, and her *virtue* in Wardour-street, has introduced a spice of humour into the associations of the word, which well-nigh neutralizes its bitterness.

Setting aside our own early associations, and the mythical impersonations of bigotry derived from the nursery and schoolroom—among whom the *bombres de bigotes*, above alluded to, and our “Bloody Mary,” figure as the most terrible examples—and striving to reduce the vague and hidden meanings of the vile opprobrium to something like definite proportions, our notion of the true bigot amounts to this—a man who does not realize his opinions; who cannot distinguish between principles and matters of indifference; is readily entrapped into some blundering compromise of the former, while eager to lead a forlorn hope, or suffer martyrdom, or wage a war of extermination in the defence and assertion of the latter.

Certainly there is no more provoking being in the world than this, whether to his friends or foes. To call such an one a bigot is a mild form of obloquy by which lips that shrink from uttering an oath may swear out their honest indignation and disgust. Not to know where to concede and where to stand out upon a point at issue is a most fatal defect of character in every relation of life. In religious and public matters it is a perpetual fret and exasperation. And this almost equally, whether the bigotry be in error *par défaut d'intelligence*, *par défaut de sentiment*, or *par défaut de connaissances*. But it by no means follows, if the above definition be a sound one, that the party charged with bigotry is always guilty of the thing. On the contrary, the failure to distinguish principles and indifferentials, in which the essence of bigotry is supposed by us to consist, may well be on the side of the accusers. Popular opinion in religious matters is the most common form of bigotry, as none certainly is more rampant in active persecution. Never was the reproach bigot more rife in people's mouths than at the beginning of the religious movement thirty years ago; but the success of that movement appears to be mainly due to the authors having limited their first efforts to the recovery and maintenance of fundamental principles. Afterwards, no doubt, a good deal of discord has been occasioned by their followers in various places ignoring or evading the necessary principles while insisting on immaterial practices and forms which accompanied the movement. Wherever principles and details have consistently gone together, they have generally prevailed in the long run. But the gift of seeing clearly to the bottom of questions, and realizing essentials, is a rare wisdom; and they who in any degree are deficient in this quality are in the same proportion in danger of becoming bigots. Zeal without knowledge was bigotry in the great Apostle before his conversion to Christianity; but afterwards his singular characteristic sympathy, willing to be all things to all men, and even to incur anathema for the sake of winning some, was consistent with an uncompromising severity in the proscription of schismatics. Nay, it was the very Apostle and prime pattern of brotherly love and charity who rushed half-naked out of the bath lest the atmosphere might be tainted with the breath of heresy.

There is no more anxious period of a great religious movement, such as we have mentioned, than the stage

when, having grown familiar with first principles and feeling quite at ease with them, leading minds, secure of their own steadfastness, begin to venture to apply them in detail to schemes and methods of comprehension. It is an anxious period, though at the same time hopeful. We have watched with the greatest interest an evidently growing tendency in this direction among earnest Churchmen; namely, to relax what is deemed by them an overstrict ecclesiasticism with the hope of gaining religious-minded Nonconformists. It is quite possible to do so, of course, without in any degree abjuring the principles or disparaging the past efforts of the movement. The movement began rightly by a stern advocacy and assertion of Church principles, and by firmly establishing the things which remained, but were in imminent danger of being lost and abandoned. We cannot be too thankful for the seeming bigotry of the early leaders of the movement; we would add, for the mistakes of their many zealous but half-instructed followers, who groped and struggled and stumbled into right and truth. They were scarcely mistakes, indeed, when they were made, for they led to a more clear definition and proof of essential principles. But what was not bigotry at an earlier period of a movement may possibly become so at a later. The circumstances of the case alter, and the same principles may be modified to meet the altered circumstances and clearer light.

We were a good deal struck by certain discussions which took place, in the course of last winter, at the offices of the Additional Curates Society in London; where clergymen meet periodically and detail their experiences, and various plans of dealing for the nonce with several classes alienated from the Church, with hereditary dissenters, open infidels, and the ungodly. One speaker in particular, who has gained a special reputation for enthusiasm and active zeal in parochial work, read a paper on his mode of treating dissenters and secularists, so called, in a district of a large manufacturing town, where he holds a pastoral cure. His aim is to break down intervening barriers, to disembody the spirit from existing formularies, and assuming an universal religious sympathy in human nature, to draw it out into spontaneous developments, with the hope, we presume, of reaching at a more advanced stage of spiritual attainment, a more uniform walk by the same rule and mind. Such a method can be carried out safely, and with a prospect of success, only, if its execution be conducted with that instinctive discretion which familiarity with and a due appreciation of first principles ensure, but which is far above the average. The person alone who feels sure of his position acts freely and as if above suspicion. It is in itself a sign of largeness of mind and nobleness of character to be independent of mere appearances and opinion. A notoriously rich man may dress and otherwise live plainly without prejudice to his respectability. A man skilful with his pencil or musical instrument will make many a bold stroke with advantage contrary to written rule; while the novice, who distrusts himself and does not feel at ease, will wisely keep to the strict letter of his instructions, carefully eschew grace-notes, and earn a freedom of hand by the drudgery of accurate drawing in outline. Pretty much the same principle holds good in pastoral theology and parochial work. The rock bigotry is a far less danger in the path of the Church's ship than the whirlpool of a pseudo-catholicity and broad-church eclecticism. We are not without suspicion and anxiety, therefore, as to the present crisis of the movement, lest what is the privileged manner of genius and a master-hand should be taken up as a fashion of the day by the mere copyist and tyro. Bigotry may be an exaggeration or imitation of religious zeal; the essence of latitudinarianism is the abnegation of religious truth. Perhaps the best safeguard against error in this direction is, to secure, *in the first instance*, the establishment of the Church's system, and then, not to lower or relax that system for purposes of comprehension, but to add on to it, as something extra and exceptional, whatever less perfect methods may be the best possible for any whom it does not reach. This we conceive to be the true intention of the practical-

mind and experienced parish clergy to whom we have alluded; and so interpreted, we cannot but allow and commend generally the wisdom of their scheme.

Convocation in Ireland.

IN 1833 a petition was presented to the House of Lords, by the present Archbishop of Dublin, from two hundred of the clergy of the Diocese of Kildare, praying for a restoration of the Synodical powers of the Church. Similar petitions numerously signed were presented by the same archbishop in 1843 and 1844. These petitions, which were all of a similar character, prayed that the United Church of England and Ireland "might enjoy the privileges permitted to other churches and religious bodies, of possessing *within herself* such a power of regulation in her spiritual affairs as may best promote the due discharge of the sacred duties required of her ministers, and provide for the religious discipline of her own members . . . and that neither to revive Convocation or to make any provisions for supplying its place were clearly at variance with the design of our reformers." The petition then stated the unfitness of Parliament for being the sole "legislative authority for the Church in spiritual matters," and prayed that steps might be taken for remedying these evils, and securing the efficiency of the Church.

The able Charge of the Archbishop of Dublin for 1844 was directed to this subject. After referring to the presentation of the above-mentioned petition, in the debate which followed, his Grace clearly described the many evils arising from the then existing state of things, and declared that the longer self-government is denied the Church, the greater and more aggravated will be the evils by which she is beset. Nor does the archbishop hesitate to say "that a large proportion of those who are now irrecoverably alienated from the Church might at this moment have been sound members of it had timely steps been taken" to restore to the Church those powers of self-government which our reformers undoubtedly intended her to possess.

Previous, however, to this, at the time of the Union in 1800, an attempt was made by the Irish Parliament to unite the Convocations as well as the Parliaments of the two kingdoms. The 18th article of the Act of Union, as proposed by them, provided that "the archbishops, bishops, deans and clergy of the Churches of England and Ireland shall from time to time be summoned to, and entitled to sit in, Convocation of the United Church, in like manner and subject to the same regulations as are at present by law established with respect to the like orders of the Church in England." And this clause was introduced into the English House of Commons.

When this article came to be considered, Mr. Pitt noticed the clause introduced by the Irish Parliament for "providing for the presence of the clergy of that country in Convocations which might be holden in this island," and pronounced it to be a reasonable addition; but on further discussion it was deemed advisable to omit the clause respecting Convocations, on the ground that his Majesty had the power of calling such a Convocation whenever he pleased, and it does not appear that the Irish bishops and clergy of the day took any further notice of the matter.

This Union of the Establishments, in 1800, is too generally looked upon as the Union of the Churches of England and Ireland, whereas a perfect union in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, has existed between them for centuries before, the Synod of Cashel, in 1172, having enjoined "that all divine matters shall for the future, in all parts of Ireland, be regulated after the model of Holy Church, according to the observance of the Anglican Church." Moreover, the first canon of 1634 accepts the English Articles of 1652 in their entirety, and declares the agreement "of the Church of England and Ireland in the Confession of the same Christian faith and the doctrines of

the sacraments." So that for six hundred years previous to the Act of Union there had been a complete spiritual and ecclesiastical agreement between the Church in England and the Church in Ireland, and that statute only made matter of statute law the union which had existed for many centuries before.

Although from the earliest periods of Irish Church History, down to the time of the Reformation, Synods of bishops and clergy were constantly held to regulate the internal affairs of the Church, yet it was not till 1615 that the Irish Provincial Synods assumed the form of our English Convocations. In that year James I. summoned a Convocation to sit in Dublin, and that Convocation consisted of an Upper and Lower House, as in England. From that time till 1711 (with the exception of the two Parliaments of William III.) Convocation sat with each Parliament, from which period down to the present day it has not been permitted to exercise either its deliberative or legislative functions.

When the Church Temporalities Act (3 & 4 William IV, cap. 37) was passed, the Convocation of the Church in Ireland being dormant, a protest was formally made against the suppression of two of her Sees, and the reduction of two of her archbishoprics to the rank of bishoprics. By the 46th clause of that act the archiepiscopal jurisdiction of the Archbishops of Tuam and Cashel was transferred to the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin respectively, and thus, as far as an act of Parliament can effect it, the four provinces of the Church in Ireland were reduced to two without even the opinion of her bishops and clergy being asked in the matter.

But although their active functions are suspended, the provincial Synods still exist; and it requires but the writ of the Crown to assemble them as a Convocation. The Provincial Synod of Dublin still meets in the year of the archbishop's triennial visitation of the province; and it is not many years since the Archbishop of Armagh also summoned the Synod of his province.

We find from the *Down and Connor and Dromore Diocesan Calendar*, for 1862, that the Lower House of the Provincial Synod of Armagh consists of twenty-eight dignitaries, eleven proctors from the chapters, and twenty-eight from the clergy of the several dioceses, making sixty-seven in all, whilst the Lower House of the Provincial Synod of Dublin consists of thirty-eight dignitaries, nineteen proctors of chapters, and thirty-eight proctors of dioceses, in all ninety-five. The Upper House in each case consisting of the six bishops of the province. Although the archbishop of each province has the power to summon his Provincial Synod whenever and wherever he pleases, without any writ or licence from the Crown, yet, to form a Convocation having legislative power, the members of these Provincial Synods must meet as one body, under a president appointed by the Crown. The Upper House of such a Convocation would consist of twelve members, the Lower, of one hundred and sixty-two, and this is the existing constitution of the Convocation of the Church in Ireland.

Such a Convocation could at once be assembled on a writ being issued by the Crown to the archbishops, directing them to summon their suffragans, and they in turn convening their clergy for the election of proctors for the several dioceses. But at present the Irish bishops, as a body, seem to prefer the assembling of a National Synod to that of their own Convocation. Last July they unanimously presented an address to her Majesty, praying "that the advice, not of one or two Provincial Synods only, but of a General Synod of the United Church of England and Ireland might be obtained, before any change is made in the doctrine, worship, discipline and government of the Church." To this address no reply beyond the formal announcement of its receipt by the Home Secretary has been given, or, if given, has not been permitted to transpire. But it will not fail to be observed that the Irish prelates have judiciously abstained from making any recommendation as to the constitution of the future

Synod, or as to the means by which its assembling may be brought about.

But it would seem that this unanimous wish of the Irish bishops for a National Synod is not so fully shared in by their clergy. At a Conference of the Clergy of the United Diocese of Down and Connor and Dromore, held in Belfast in October, 1861, under the presidency of the bishop, one of the four sessions was occupied in considering the subject of Synodical action. A paper on Convocation having been read by the Rev. Alfred T. Lee, the Hon. Sec. to the Conference, and the matter fully discussed, it was resolved unanimously:—

1. "That it is the opinion of this Conference that the interests of the Irish Branch of the United Church imperatively require the immediate resuscitation of its Synodical powers.

2. "That the Archbishops and Bishops of the Irish provinces having lately memorialized Her Majesty to summon a General Synod of the United Church, this Conference is of opinion, that, even should the prayer of that memorial be granted, it will still be necessary that the Irish Convocation should, from time to time, assemble to consider affairs peculiar to our own Branch of the United Church.

3. "That this expression of our opinion be conveyed, through the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, to His Grace the Lord Primate, with a respectful request that His Grace will take the necessary steps to obtain the permission of the Crown for the assembling of Irish Convocation at the commencement of the next session of the Imperial Parliament."

The reply of the Primate to this resolution was to the effect that having, in conjunction with his brother prelates, requested the Queen to assemble a National Synod, he could not, until her Majesty's reply was received, take any further action in the matter.

Such is the present position of Synodical matters in Ireland. Although her Majesty's reply has not yet been given, or at least not made public, it requires but little foresight to see that this request of the Irish prelates will be respectfully refused. A National Synod could not be assembled, with any prospect of united action, until the Convocations of Canterbury and York, as well as that of the Church in Ireland, have been consulted as to its constitution and the rules which shall guide its future deliberations; and the first step towards the assembling of such a Synod must therefore be the revival of Irish Convocation. The present time is most favourable for such a step. At the session of the Convocation of Canterbury held in February last, a resolution was proposed and carried, on the motion of the Bishop of Oxford, in which the Archbishop of Canterbury was requested to confer with the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, and request them "to take such steps as to them may seem expedient to obtain the advice and concurrence of their branch of the United Church," to the authorization of a special form of thanksgiving for harvest. The Convocation of Canterbury has thus formally requested the co-operation of their Irish brethren, and the Convocation of York in its last session has shown the same friendly spirit. Let then the Irish bishops and clergy forthwith request her Majesty to permit their Convocation to assemble and consider this and other important matters affecting the interests and welfare of the Church. This request, in common justice, cannot be denied. If the Convocations of Canterbury and York are permitted to assemble and deliberate each session of Parliament, and even to enact a new canon under royal licence, what pretence can there be for withholding the same privilege from the Irish provinces of the United Church? When by the revival of Irish Convocation the action of the Provincial Synods of the Church shall thus be completed, it will then be time enough to consider further the question of a National Synod.



REVIEWS.

Lord Stanhope's Life of William Pitt.*

IT is hardly to be supposed that Lord Stanhope's excellent sense permits him to fret after a reputation which it has long been impossible for him to achieve. Indeed, any hankering to be called a fine writer would be more than usually unreasonable in a historian whose works might not inaptly be cited as an implied protest against the necessity of setting off true facts and honest convictions with the unadorned decency and order of common grammar itself. The commendation, which is his right, is of another and a better order than even the higher genius of his correlative Lord Macaulay will eventually command. A homely reliable narrative, historical or biographical, though it be somewhat uncouthly put together, is far more worth having than the most brilliant idealization of a man or an epoch, in which the fictitious incidents are falsehoods, and the illusions culpable and perilous deceits. Lord Stanhope is as rarely to be admired as Lord Macaulay is to be constantly mistrusted; but the genius of the one is outweighed by the integrity of the other. If morality be always an overmatch for intellect in a competition for true fame, Lord Macaulay must take rank farther below the dignity of a first-rate historian for a lack of truth than Lord Stanhope needs to do for a faulty style.

After establishing, therefore, or conceding, or taking for granted, the fact that this Biography of Pitt is as reliable as it is abundant, the first thing to be done is to withdraw, as utterly useless, all attempts to criticise it as a literary composition. His generation has so long agreed to accept Lord Stanhope among its writers, that it must be content henceforth to submit in silent patience to imperfections that will never be amended now. Let us strive to forget that he is clumsy, that his literary garb *rusticius defluit*, and let us continually remind ourselves how burly and honest is the truthfulness which the rags and tags of his untidy paragraphs overspread. He has given us a full, and not unpicturesque Life of our great modern Minister, and one which, in spite of its drawback of style, will probably be final. What has been told might perhaps have been better told, but there is plainly nothing more to tell. One very praiseworthy quality of the book is the carefulness with which the secondary characters have been elaborated. It is too much the habit of biographers to take for granted that their readers know all about the men and women among whom their subject lived and acted, and the affairs in which he interfered. They consequently surround their hero with nothing more life-like or picturesque than the names of his contemporaries and allusions to historical events; Lord Stanhope, on the contrary, has carefully sketched the characters of Dundas, Wilberforce, Canning, and the rest of the younger or second-rate men who grouped themselves around Mr. Pitt; and, without thrusting them unduly into that central prominence which the subject of his Biography could alone occupy with propriety in the general picture, he has given great dramatic vivacity to the figures of Mr. Fox and his disciples. Nor has he been less lavish in supplying an *entourage* of events. The third and fourth volumes, without for one moment trenching upon the domain of History, are beyond measure rich in public incident. The story of the Mutiny of the Fleets at Portsmouth and Sheerness is particularly well introduced; and the episode of General Humbert's landing at Killala, as are all the other glimpses of the Irish Rebellion, is given in a manner unhappily only too rare with the writer. These last two

volumes are indeed far better than the two first; and the interval between Mr. Pitt's resignation and his final assumption of office, which promised naturally to be the barest portion of the book, is, by sheer skill, made almost the most interesting. Upon Pitt's conduct during that difficult period too much praise can hardly be bestowed. He would seem almost to have acted with deliberate intent to show that it was possible for a politician out of office to behave like a high-minded and generous gentleman to his opponents and successors. The days of Mr. Addington's administration were unfortunate and brief; but, such as they were, they endured only through his rival's nobleness and forbearance; and whatever alleviation there was of their vexation and difficulty was owing to that rival's co-operation and support. It has too often been the custom to decry the first Lord Sidmouth. His administration was certainly feeble, but he was not. He was a man of more than ordinary capacity, and in less urgent times would have ably filled the post of which his occupation in the days of the French Revolution was a misfortune no less to himself than to his country. Nor had he any great talent at his disposal for the formation of a strong cabinet. Mr. Fox, the Grenvilles, and Sheridan, with all the legitimate opponents of Pitt, who should have been in any ministry that took the place of his, stood aloof from the ranks of his successor. Under the administration of the former they were no less excluded from office than they had been under that of the latter; and, notwithstanding the pleasure with which they welcomed the downfall of Pitt, it may be doubted whether there was as much heart in the support which decency demanded from them to the man whom they had helped to elevate, as there was in the self-forgetful counsels and adhesion of his generous rival and superior.

But it is not alone in his treatment of Mr. Addington that Lord Stanhope has been careful to keep in prominence the rectitude and the moral ascendancy of Mr. Pitt. To the last day of his public life he made good the noble declaration with which he may be said almost to have commenced it. Within a year of his introduction to Parliament he had been accused by Lord North's supporters—he was himself then in the ranks of the opposition—of attacking the conduct of the Admiralty Board, from feelings of enmity to the Earl of Sandwich. "I support the motion," cried Pitt, in his reply, "from motives of a public nature, and from those motives only. I am too young to be supposed capable of entertaining any personal enmity against the Earl of Sandwich; and I trust that when I shall be less young, it will appear that I have early determined, in the most solemn manner, never to allow any private and personal consideration whatever to influence my public conduct at any one period of my life." The offer, made to him by Lord Rockingham, of the Vice-Treasurership of Ireland, with nothing to do for a salary of 5,000*l.* a-year, was a trifling test of the sincerity and strength of the boy's declaration, compared to that which he underwent before he was a year older or stronger. Before the close of 1783 the Marquis of Rockingham had died, and his successor the Earl of Shelbourne had resigned. George the Third, whose two chief antipathies in domestic politics, one of them wise, the other foolish, were Catholic Emancipation and the domination of the great Whig families, was beside himself in the search for a Premier. Lord North and Mr. Fox had just then concluded, in their coalition, a sanction for much that is mean and evil-hearted in the struggle for office; but though branded with the dislike of the king, and the disgust of the wisest and best among their own followers, their union seemed to challenge alike both the monarch and the country to frame a cabinet without one or both of them. In this emergency, and as a last hope of emancipation from so disgraceful a cabal, George the Third, with the sanction, if not at the suggestion, of Lord Chancellor Thurlow, offered the Headship of the Treasury to Mr. Pitt. The offer was accompanied with full authority to choose every one of his colleagues. Few young orators of four-and-twenty summers, and two or three successful sessions in

* *The Life of the Right Honourable William Pitt*, by Earl Stanhope. 4 vols. Murray.

the House of Commons, would, under such circumstances, have retained self-possession enough to think of holding back for the one day which Mr. Pitt asked for consultation and decision. Still fewer would, after a week of anxious deliberation, have sent any such reply as the following was, to the king who sought to honour them.

"Mr. Pitt received, this morning, the honour of your Majesty's gracious commands. With infinite pain he feels himself under the necessity of humbly expressing to your Majesty, that, with every sentiment of dutiful attachment to your Majesty, and zealous desire to contribute to the public service, it is utterly impossible for him, after the fullest consideration of the situation in which things stand, and of what passed yesterday in the House of Commons, to think of undertaking, under such circumstances, the situation which your Majesty has had the condescension and goodness to propose to him.

"As what he now presumes to write is the final result of his best reflection, he would think himself criminal, if, by delaying till to-morrow humbly to lay it before your Majesty, he should be the cause of your Majesty's not immediately turning your royal mind to such a plan of arrangement as the exigency of the present circumstances may, in your Majesty's wisdom, seem to require."

"Mr. Pitt, I am much hurt to find that you are determined to decline," wrote George the Third, in answer to this magnanimous rejection of the highest office; and if the young statesman were then suffering at all from the internal soreness of suppressed vanity, in this one expression of his sovereign he might have found a salve. But Pitt felt the exigencies of the Crown at that moment far too keenly to recognize with pleasure in them any marks of his own importance. Such as he was when he resigned the seals to Lord Sidmouth, he was when he left the cabinet doors open to Lord North and Mr. Fox, and the associates of their unmanly coalition. Nor was his moderation left long unrewarded. A few months were sufficient to demonstrate the impossibility of the new administration. How long it might have held together but for the magnificent whiggery of Mr. Fox's famous India Bill is hardly a matter of speculation. The passion of "the Revolution families" for turning the government of the country into a private oligarchy of their own would probably have broken out sooner or later in some form equally incompatible with the tolerance of the Court or the nation at large. The dismissal of Lord North and Mr. Fox brought to Mr. Pitt his compulsory reward. He was now the only possible prime-minister, and he entered the treasury to the joy of his master, and with the concurrence of the people. The consciousness that his former rejection of office was generally known enabled him to avail himself of the king's pertinacity, and through a succession of vexatious defeats to work his way to a majority in a hostile House of Commons. From the year 1783 he may be said to have retained office till his death. The intercalation of Lord Sidmouth's Cabinet only relieved him of such labours of routine as make the weariness of an actual minister. Until his nominal return to power, he was still the arch-director of the councils of England, the oracle to which its weaker leaders recurred for sanction and guidance. The steadiness of his career is as wonderful as its abrupt commencement. He was evidently constructed for it; born to it. He seemed to take the premiership at the outset of his life as his destiny, and to be confirmed in it by the instinct of his countrymen. No modern minister, in England or elsewhere, has ever had so firm a hold of power as was his; and, with temptations to impurity and ambition that have seldom been transcended since the days of Elizabeth, few have ever lived and died as pure and as modest as he.

Biblical Psychology.*



Of all the various objects towards which man's thoughts and interests are directed, there is nothing which can be so interesting to him as himself. "The proper study of mankind is man,"

* Olshausen: *Opuscula*, Art. 6.—*Delitzsch's Biblische Psychologie*. Second Edition, 1861.

is a saying which can never become stale, any more than it can cease to be true. Nor can it be said that the study of our common human nature has ever been entirely neglected even in this country, in which we are supposed to have little taste for metaphysics or psychology. Although the progress towards decision in psychological theories seems but slow, although idealist and sensationalist remain in their old rigid antagonism, and the disciple of the "common sense" school or the eclectic still holds aloof from both, and strives to find a solid footing on ground equally removed from the cloud-land of the one and the materialism of the other, still the inquiry is happily not abandoned; and if the general theories remain substantially the same, there is something contributed, in the course of the struggle, towards clearing the ground and making the positions of the adverse party mutually intelligible. There is, however, one branch of this great question which has been almost entirely neglected by the whole Christian Church in modern times, the psychology of the sacred Scriptures. It might seem the most natural thing possible, for one who wished to investigate the nature of man in a Christian spirit, to ask whether any light was thrown upon the question by the Word of God, and if so, what amount of guidance might be derived from its intimations. The words of Tertullian are most appropriately prefixed to a section of his work by Delitzsch: "Learn of God what you have from God; or if not from Him, then from no one." We are far from thinking the time wasted which has been bestowed upon the philosophy of consciousness; but we are bound to believe that the most subtle investigator of mental phenomena would derive help from that which is "a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

The importance of a careful study of the Biblical account of man's nature will be overlooked by no thoughtful student of the Scriptures. To say nothing of the additional clearness of conception, and hence of expression, which would thereby be imparted to the Christian teacher, every one who has studied the inspired writings with the reverence which they deserve and demand, who has made an effort, not simply to catch the general meaning of any particular passage, but to understand every word of that awful volume of which no "jot or tittle" shall ever pass away, must have been met by the difficulty of assigning a distinct meaning to various words which sometimes seem to be interchangeable, sometimes separate and distinct, in their significations. Such words as *spirit*, *soul*, *understanding*, *mind*, *heart*, occur to us at once. Are these words employed in a loose, popular sense, or in a strict invariable sense; or are they sometimes used popularly, sometimes with the intention of marking certain distinctions in our inner man? However these questions may be answered, it is desirable that we should know what is the answer. If they have no distinct and special meaning save that which is determined by the context, it is well that such a conclusion should be made good by a careful induction of the particular passages in which they occur. If the reverse be the case, if each word has a distinct meaning of its own, sometimes it may be more generic, sometimes more specific, which seems *a priori* the reasonable as well as the reverent way of viewing the subject, then it is desirable that those meanings should be ascertained. Let us take a single illustration of the importance of such definitions. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." (1 Cor. xiv. 15.) What can this mean? Does not the understanding belong to the spirit? In the wider sense of the word *spirit*, unquestionably it does. Then the word must have a more limited meaning? It is only by investigations which belong to Biblical psychology that difficulties such as these can be solved.

We can refer to the subject in this place only in general terms. Happily the means of becoming better acquainted with it are increasing among ourselves. Attention has been directed to it by Dean Alford and Dean Ellicott, in their *Commentaries*, and by the latter in his sermons on the *Destiny of the Creature*, in which, as he would himself

be the first to admit, he has been under considerable obligation to the work of Delitzsch which we have named. Whether a complete *system* of Biblical psychology be a possibility or not we do not pretend to say. It must be tried before it can be pronounced to be impossible. The materials for it are far more abundant than a mere reader of the English version of the Bible would suppose. The basis of the whole inquiry lies, of course, in the distinction of body, soul, and spirit. In our common language we use the words soul and spirit interchangeably. It may be asserted that this is never the case in the Scriptures. By this we do not mean that the one word could never be substituted for the other, so as to make a meaning which was true and substantially the same, but that the words are never used to mean exactly the same thing. Let it be remembered that, in the words of Delitzsch, "Biblical psychology is no science of yesterday." A subject which occupied the mind and the pen of Tertullian may well be thought worthy of being carefully studied in our own days. When S. Paul speaks of "body, soul, and spirit," it is hardly a reverent estimate of one who spake as he was "moved by the Holy Ghost," to say that the expression was tautological. But it is not merely in such expressions as these that the distinction of soul and spirit is pointed out. Let readers of the Greek Testament mark the words of the same Apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 44, "It is sown a *natural* (a soulish) body, it is raised a spiritual body;" and in the same Epistle (ii. 14), "The natural (soulish) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God . . . they are spiritually discerned;" and it will be perceived that there is not merely a distinction, but a contrast indicated between the *soul* and the *spirit*. To those who may wish for a brief examination of this particular point, we may recommend the perusal of the short article in Olshausen's *Opuscula*. For a more complete investigation of the subject we know of no work to be compared with Delitzsch's *Biblical Psychology*. We may not accept all his conclusions; but we may at least promise those who enter upon the study of his work that they will find in him a favourable contrast to too many of his countrymen, in the possession of a calm, reverent, and devout tone of mind, and that they will meet with little or nothing at variance with "those things which are most surely believed among us."

Mendelssohn's Letters.*



HAT shall be said for Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, the genius, poet, and musician, who perished in the noontide of his glory, snatched away in the very fulness of his power, just as the world began to admire and to love him? Fortunately, his genius as a musician has given him a name high up among the immortals, and if anything were now needed to render it more illustrious and more charming, this volume of *Letters* would afford all that could be wished for. Here we have him as he really was in life, bright, ardent, and affectionate, in the spring and flush of his youthful enthusiasm; full of eloquence, good sense, and feeling; whether talking of the common incidents of his journey, the pictures of Venice, the music at Rome, the beggars at Naples, or the snowy ravines of Switzerland. Taken merely as letters, these may for beauty of style rank among the very highest; their natural grace, vivacity, and truth, being preserved by the skill of the translator, even in their English dress. They read, in fact, like English letters; though not one Englishman in a million could present us with so charming a mixture of wisdom, wit, and graceful imagination. All this is the more remarkable when we remember that they were written when Mendelssohn was but twenty-one years of age;—extending over the two years, 1830-1832, that were spent in Italy and Swit-

* *Letters from Italy and Switzerland*, by Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy. Translated from the German by Lady Wallace. Longmans. 1861.

zerland. The few extracts our space admits of will give but a faint idea of their full beauty.

His whole life seemed one unbroken "Song without words;" at home or abroad, at work or idling away the sunny mornings at Rome, or in the green valley of Interlachen: and in this respect we know of no musician of ancient or modern times with whom we may compare him. To the devout piety of Handel he added the tenderness of a loving heart, and the sprightliness of Mozart. If he talks of pictures, we imagine that he was born a painter; if of sculpture, that he must himself have handled the chisel of Thorwaldsen, as well as charmed him on the piano; or if of poetry, that he was born a poet. But when he touches on music, *then* we feel and know at once that *this* is his master-passion that moulds and sways his whole being. The very pulses of his heart beat afresh, with new life, at its sound. He thinks music, talks music—what wonder that he sings and plays as if his life depended on it. Of such a book no fair notion can be formed by mere extract. Only the whole volume suffices; a difficulty not to be surmounted even by the most ardent critic.

Most of his letters are to his sister Fanny, and from these our extracts are chiefly culled. We will first hear him talk of pictures;—of *The Entombment*, by Titian, he says:—

"Here is the conclusion of a great tragedy; so still, so grand, so acutely painful; Magdalene supporting Mary, fearing that she will die of anguish; she endeavours to lead her away, but once more looks round herself, evidently wishing to imprint this spectacle indelibly on her heart, thinking it is for the last time;—and then the sorrowing John, who sympathizes and suffers with Mary; and Joseph, who absorbed in his piety, and occupied with the tomb, directs and conducts the whole; and Christ Himself lying there so tranquil, having endured to the end: then the blaze of brilliant colour and the gloomy sky! It all speaks to the heart and fills me with enthusiasm, and will never leave my memory."

When artists talk learnedly of Guido's *Aurora*, he calls it the very type of haste and impetus; for surely no man ever imagined such hurry and tumult, such sounding and clashing, while of the modern painters at Rome he draws a most amusing picture:—

"The *Café Greco*, where they congregate, is a small dark room, about eight feet square, where on one side you may smoke, but not on the other; so they sit round on benches, with their broad-leaved hats on their heads, and their huge mastiffs beside them; their cheeks and throats and the whole of their faces covered with hair, puffing forth clouds of smoke (only on one side of the room), and saying rude things to each other while the mastiffs swarm with vermin. They drink coffee, and talk of Titian and Pordenone, just as if *they* were sitting beside them with beards and wide-awakes!"

In this and a hundred other such passages we find traces of his bright and genial good sense, and everywhere tokens of his taste and *naïveté*. The first time he orders his supper in Italian, he says:—

"My tongue skated away as if on slippery ice, first gliding into English, and then stumbling afresh. I was famously cheated the next morning, but I did not in the least care, and so on we went."

Nothing upsets his good-humour; nothing annoys him. The landlord takes hold of the sack-cloth sheets, and says:—

"'Very fine linen;' but I," says Mendelssohn, "slept as sound as a bear, and, before falling asleep I said to myself, 'Now you are in the Apennines.'"

When would-be musicians asked him what he thought of Mozart and all his sins, he replied:—

"As far as I am concerned, I should feel only too happy to renounce all my virtues in exchange for Mozart's sins."

With a noble and generous appreciation of excellence in others, he ever spoke and wrote of himself with the modesty which marks true genius:—

"I can form," he says to his sister, "no judgment of my new compositions; I cannot tell whether they are good or bad; and this arises from the circumstance that all the people to whom I have played anything for the last twelve months forthwith glibly declared it to be wonderfully beautiful; and that will never do. I wish some one would let me have a little rational blame once more, &c. &c."

But the happiest passages are little touches of quiet humour, as in a letter to his father, where he describes the exceeding slowness of a slow coachman:—

"I had the greatest difficulty in not belabouring the driver, indeed I did so more than once; but he then gravely assured me that we were going at a capital pace, and I had no means of proving the contrary!"

And the same pen that could thus be gravely full of humour could also be profoundly wise:—

"They," he says—"the Italians at Rome—are mentally enervated and apathetic. They have a religion, but do not believe in it; they have a Pope and a Government, but they turn them into ridicule; they can recall a brilliant and heroic past, but they do not value it;"

in which few lines lies the germ of a dozen essays.

Here and there he sums up the character of other nations in a few brief, pointed sentences, as in sketching the Neapolitans:—

"There is no shop where you are not cheated. And one of my acquaintance, who had dealt at the same shop for fifteen years, told me that during the whole of that period there had invariably been the same battle about a few scudi, and that nothing could prevent it."

When Mendelssohn sets to work at music he regards it in the highest sense of duty:—

"I take music," he says, "in a very serious light, and I consider it quite inadmissible to compose anything I do not feel. It is just as if I were to utter a falsehood; for notes have as distinct a meaning as words, perhaps even a more definite sense."

No wonder, therefore, that all his music is full of tender and deep feeling, sparkling in his lighter or comic moods into genuine sunshine; that he is always in earnest, and reaches every heart that really knows what music is.

Nowhere does he write more genially and gracefully than at the Eternal City, where his room, in the Piazza di Spagna, commanding a good view, was all day long lighted up by a warm sun. There he had a good Viennese piano; on the table were portraits of Palestrina, Allegri, &c., with scores of their works, and a Latin Psalm book, from which he composed his *Non nobis*:—

"When I come into this room," he says, "early in the morning, and see the sun shining so brightly on the breakfast-table, I feel so cheerful and comfortable, for it is now far on in the autumn, and who in our country at this season looks for warmth, or a bright sky, or grapes, or flowers? After breakfast I begin my work, and play and sing and compose till near noon. Then Rome in all her vast dimensions lies before me, like an interesting problem to enjoy; but I go deliberately to work, daily selecting some different object appertaining to history. When I am occupied in the forenoon I am unwilling to leave off, and should like to continue my writing, but I say to myself that I must see the Vatican, and when there I equally dislike leaving it; thus each of my occupations causes me the most genuine pleasure, and one enjoyment follows another. When I have fairly imprinted an object like this on my mind, and each day a fresh one, twilight has usually arrived, and the day is over."

This is a charming picture; charming for its truth and its graceful freshness; and with such pictures these *Letters* abound, especially when he is writing to his sister Fanny, to whom he was deeply attached. She was a fine musician herself, and could therefore enter fully into all his ardent tastes, wishes, and pursuits; and to her he pours out all his heart.

The scenery round Rome has been described a thousand times, but rarely has it been described so simply, so picturesquely, so truly, as by the painter musician. But here our narrowing space warns us that extracts must cease. A whole host of pleasant topics, therefore, we leave for our readers' own discovery and enjoyment; and among these we include the long and interesting interview with Goëthe, the Passion music in Lent at Rome, a sketch of Horace Vernet, a visit to Pompeii, Naples, Rome itself; fine art criticisms of the daintiest and keenest fancy; a journey through Switzerland, life in Paris, and many others of equal interest. One more short paragraph, and we have done. It is dated Rome, Dec. 21, 1830:—

"I really cannot compose a tolerable song here, for who is there to sing it to me? But I am writing a grand fugue, *Wir glauben all*, and sing it to myself in such a fashion that my friend the Captain (his fellow lodger) rushes down stairs in alarm, puts in his head, and asks what I want? I answer a counter-theme. But how much I do really want; and yet how much I have got! Thus life passes onwards."

So wrote this happy genius in his twenty-first year. Within eighteen years of that date he was in his grave;

but then all Europe rang with his fame, as the nations sorrowed for his untimely loss. It is a proud and pleasant reflection that England after all was the land to which he turned for appreciation, and which most truly responded to his devotion. Here he found a home; and nowhere else was his Elijah welcomed with greater or truer enthusiasm. They saw and admired the genius who wrote the exquisite overture to the *Midsummer Night's Dream* when but sixteen, an age at which many a youth—

"Has scarce begun to call his thoughts his own."

They admired his modesty, his intelligence, his sterling merit; and were inclined to envy quiet, dull, Berlin the honour of being his birth-place. Here, in England, his music lives and will live, at least until the New Zealander comes to sketch London-bridge. All true musicians love to give him the fame he was slow, yet so well entitled, to take for himself:—

"You reproach me," he says in 1831, "with being twenty-two without having acquired fame. To this I can reply, had it been the will of God that I should be renowned at this age, I no doubt should have been so. My duty simply is to write only as I feel, and according to what is in my heart, and to leave the results to Him who disposes of other and greater matters."

With these few brave, Christian words we close our notice of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, leaving our simple outline to be filled up by our readers' own deliberate judgment from this entertaining volume of *Letters*. The picture is well worth completing; and to loving hands it will be a task of unmingled pleasure.

Lord Auckland's Journal and Correspondence.*

IF any people are to be envied by contrast they certainly are the historians of the next generation, when compared with those of the last. And next to the writers, and in a degree but little inferior to them, the readers will have reason to congratulate themselves that their lot was cast at the end of the century rather than at the beginning. Fifty years ago the historian of our country had to grope his painful way by the dim light of despatches, gazettes, and Parliamentary speeches. The very greatest artists, knowing that at best the materials within their reach enabled them to give but an outline of the truth, were, at the same time, painfully conscious that even that outline was often not only faint, but incorrect; as, indeed, was inevitable whenever the secret motives of the principal actors differed from those which they professed: and still more when, as sometimes happened, they were acting under influences of which they themselves were, perhaps, hardly aware. But within the last few years a fashion has sprung up which has prompted the descendants of the leading men of the reign of George III. to lay before the public the note-books, and journals, and correspondence of their ancestors. And this has been done with so little reserve that, along with the actions themselves, we find the motives which led to them equally laid open to our view; the progress of intrigues whether baffled or triumphant; the calculations of disappointed or successful ambition; the jealousies, suspicions, and rivalries which set politician against politician; the jobs which the minister did; the anger which he provoked when he refused to do more jobs; the manœuvres by which pressure was put upon those in power; the counter-manœuvres by which that pressure was resisted; the causes of appointments, concessions, denials, inconsistency, and sometimes even of consistency, are revealed in the confidential statements of the actors themselves. And the future historian, instead of deploring the paucity of his materials, will rather be inclined to complain of the superabundance, of the labour

* *The Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland*, with a Preface and Introduction by the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells. In four volumes. Vols. III. and IV. —London, Bentley.

and difficulty of sifting and winnowing, and extracting the precious grain of truth from the vast and conflicting mass of statements and counter-statements. Of the greatness of the mass he will have some reason to complain, since, of all the publications to which we have been alluding, there is hardly one which is not at least twice as large as it ought to have been. But that the assertions not only of opinion, but also of fact contained in one man's letters differ from the statements made by another, not only affords no cause of complaint, but is a proof of the ungarbled genuineness of each publication. We may see another proof of this also in the zeal with which the editors espouse the arguments of the original diarist or letter-writer. Being, in almost every instance, near kinsmen, they have looked upon themselves as holding a brief for the upholding of the character of their relative; but, nevertheless, they conduct their cause with such honesty that it often happens that the strongest facts against him are to be found in the very letters which they voluntarily produce. The only case in which we can fairly object to this advocate-like view of their position is when it leads them to be unjust to the contemporaries of their client, who, even when their rivalry in life was hardly perceptible, yet after their death are often treated as enemies as often as the disparagement of their credit seems to open the easiest road to the establishment of his reputation.

Of publications of this class the correspondence of the first Lord Auckland, of which the volumes before us are the corresponding portion, are among the most interesting, and the most important. They relate to the most momentous period in the history of modern Europe, or, perhaps, of the world. The first entry in them is in March, 1793, the month after the French Republic declared war against Great Britain. The last letter is dated April 11, 1814, the very day on which the heir of that republic, Napoleon, put an end to it and its various progeny by signing the treaty which removed him from France to Elba, and established the representative of her ancient kings on his hereditary throne. And the riches of the materials which these volumes contain correspond to the interest of the epoch to which they relate. We have letters in profusion from Pitt, from Lord Loughborough, from Lord Grenville, from Lord Grey; all, at one time or another, breathing the spirit of the most confidential friendship, and letting us behind the scenes of courts and cabinets to an extent which may make an imaginative reader almost fancy himself one of the initiated. In this point of view they certainly possess an interest superior to that of any similar publication, except the correspondence of Lord Malmesbury; and, oddly enough, Lord Malmesbury's diary is the book which most excites the indignation of Lord Auckland's editor. Into the merits of the dispute between the rival diplomatists, rivals even in death, we do not care to enter; but as the fame of a far greater man than either is somewhat implicated, we must be allowed to say that nothing but the most wilful blindness could pretend to be taken unawares by Pitt's advocacy, in 1801, of what was commonly, though somewhat absurdly, called Catholic Emancipation. The removal of the political disabilities affecting the Roman Catholics was, from the very first, an absolutely inseparable ingredient in the Union. And that it was so is proved, among other testimonies, by a letter from Lord Cornwallis in the Castlereagh correspondence, on a page* from which the editor of the present volumes actually cites the next letter where the Lord Lieutenant couples "the Union and Catholic Emancipation" together, adding "the restoration of perfect tranquillity" as the fruit of the combination, to the ripening of which both the measures thus mentioned were indispensable. Nor, though the *argumentum ad hominem* is not a favourite of ours, is it possible in this case to omit all notice of the fact that, though Lord Auckland permitted himself on this occasion to allude to Pitt's conduct in terms so insulting that the great minister broke off all communication with him for the future, the last vote he ever gave on the subject of the Catholic claims was in the spirit of the measure brought forward by Pitt, and de-

* Vol. IV. p. 25.

nounced by Lord Auckland eleven years before.* In an age like the present, when the head of a liberal ministry is a noble lord who for above a score of years acted with Percival, Lord Liverpool, Canning, and the Duke of Wellington; while the chief of the conservative opposition is the same statesman who was the most eloquent member of the cabinet that carried the Reform Bill, it may seem visionary to insist too earnestly on long political consistency; but we cannot forbear from submitting to the editor of these volumes, in defence of the memory of one of the ablest of our British diplomatists, that, while the statement (III. 143) that Lord Malmesbury left Pitt to follow the fortunes of Fox, and then left Fox to follow Pitt, is one the accuracy of which may very fairly be questioned, there is enough before us to show that, be it ever so true, Lord Malmesbury had not far to look to find others to keep him in countenance.

But there is, as we have already intimated, much in these volumes of more importance and interest than these wretched personalities. We need hardly dwell on the detail given in the earlier portions of the atrocities of Paris, since they have been related so often that there is now no novelty in the description to mitigate our horror at the recollection. But the accounts of the war in the Netherlands are as frequent and full as those in Lord Malmesbury, and they also present them to us in a somewhat different point of view. Everybody with a grain of penetration seems to have found out the Prince of Coburg; but we can hardly conceive how those who did so failed to discover the still greater incompetency of Mack. The only question now is whether the wretched man was more coward or more traitor. Yet, in 1793, Lord Auckland is never weary of extolling his "eminent talents and services." (III. 59, 69, &c.) Further on we arrive at an interesting and in many respects new account of the Irish Rebellions in 1798 and 1803; and many of Mr. Beresford's letters deserve the most careful attention from any one who would really desire to form an accurate idea of the miserable state of Ireland before the Union. It is true that Lord Castlereagh's correspondence has already shown it very completely; but the antediluvian dimensions of that publication have prevented, and always will prevent, its being generally known: and those who shrink from encountering twelve large volumes may be thankful to those who, like the present editor, give them a great deal of the information they desire in a quarter of one. As a matter of course, in a work like that before us, we have anecdotes upon anecdotes of the Prince of Wales; we grieve to say, what is now almost equally a matter of course, a greater acquaintance with his Royal Highness fails to increase our respect for him in a corresponding degree. We have also one piece of personal gossip about Pitt himself which has produced a war of advertisements between the rival publishers Mr. Bentley and Mr. Murray; since Lord Stanhope in his life of Pitt, not having seen the letters which passed between him and Lord Auckland on the subject of his desired marriage with Miss Eleanor Eden, gives an account, from hearsay, which the present Lord Auckland, with the letters before him, pronounces to be wholly erroneous. The exceeding carelessness with which Lord Stanhope has executed every part of his work peeps out here also, in a way which cannot fail to impress every reader with a belief of Lord Auckland's superior accuracy. He says, as Lord Auckland points out, that the lady in question "was born in July, 1777, and therefore only eight years younger than Pitt," and draws from this similarity of age an inference that "it would have been a very suitable marriage;" but as Pitt was born in 1759, the difference in their ages was eighteen years, not eight. The affair will hardly now be regarded as one of general importance; yet it is not impossible that a happy marriage might have protracted the great minister's life. The entire breakup of his constitution, which carried him off nine years later, surely originated in that absorption of his whole life in political considerations and official duties, from which the charms of a home, a wife, and a rising family would have afforded a seasonable and, in all

* See vol. IV. p. 383, note.

probability, with a man of Pitt's cordial, cheerful temper, an effectual diversion. And in this view of the case the result of this love-passage may have had no small influence on the fortunes of England and the world. We have also abundant gossip about less important personages; and one bit, though it concerns a gentleman of less than six months old, we cannot resist transcribing for the comfort of other "only fathers of only sons," who may perhaps fancy themselves visited with an unprecedented infliction of nursery solitudes. Of the noble and puissant imp Lord Pevensey, born in July, 1802, Lord Sheffield, his father, writes in the following November,—"My lady and boy are well; but when the young baron looks ruddy, he is going to be ill; when pale, he is ill; when he does not go to sleep early, there is a great irritation of nerves; and when he sleeps quite well, he is bilious." (iv. 174.) To return to graver matters, a letter from Mr. Hatsell, in 1798 (iv. 63), shows that, on the first proposal of the income-tax, its great defect in taxing life-incomes as heavily as permanent incomes did not escape notice; though the reflections arising from this circumstance are the reverse of comforting, since objections which so great a financier as Pitt, with the aid of a man so conversant with such subjects, and with so shrewd a head for the management of details as Lord Auckland, could not remove, may well be expected to prove insurmountable to inferior intellects. Of the history of the Grey and Grenville ministry we have, as might well be expected, considering that Lord Auckland himself filled no unimportant place in it, the best account that has yet been given; and, in a letter of Lord Liverpool's (iv. 308), a singularly shrewd delineation of the character of that most overrated of prime ministers, Lord Grenville. But to give anything like an adequate idea of the multifarious contents of these volumes is out of the question in the narrow compass of a single article. Nor is it necessary; those who take a proper interest in that most important of all worldly subjects, a correct understanding of the history of their own country, will be sure to read the volumes themselves; and they will certainly find a most valuable collection of documents, in general edited with great care and judgment, and wanting nothing but a little more liberal weeding.

Elizabeth Barrett Browning.*

WE have in Mrs. Browning an example of the highest point ever yet reached by a female writer of poetry. But however highly endowed a woman may be, she cannot possess that calm wisdom, that steady strength of wing, which belong to the greater poets. If conscious of unusual power, yet vexed by the necessary limitations of that power, she will probably strive to surpass her rivals by departing from the true region of poetry, or by breaking the laws of the art. Mrs. Browning did so in several ways. Though capable of rigorous melodious verse, she often wilfully chose to spoil her finest efforts by discordant rhythm and impossible rhyme. She wrote political poetry, and so absurd was the result that all the world would have laughed had an unknown author produced it. But men grieved that Mrs. Browning should prostitute her fine faculty in such a way. Worse than this, she was tempted—in *Aurora Leigh* especially—to the very verge of the profane and the indecorous. All these faults were necessary results of her fretful beating against the bars of her cage. She was great; but not great enough for her own restless ambition. If we compare her with a poetess like Miss Landon, or Mrs. Hemans, we see at once the injury which she has done herself. Could Mrs. Browning have been content with doing that which lay within her power, her vast superiority would have been far more apparent. But, not satisfied with the capacity to excel all women,

* *Last Poems*, by Elizabeth Barrett Browning.—London, Chapman and Hall.

she desired to contest the palm with all men. Hence, like the De Staël, like Georges Sand, Currer Bell, George Eliot, she was betrayed by the very greatness of her powers and of her desires. There is something very sad in this rebellion against the laws of their own nature which characterizes all epicene women.

Mrs. Browning's chronic ill-health probably suffices to account for much of the morbid tone to be found in her poems, and especially for her theory that suffering is the poetic heritage. In the fine wild lyric entitled *A Musical Instrument*, she repeats this theory:—

"Yet half a beast is the great god Pan,
To laugh as he sits by the river,
Making a poet out of a man:
The true gods sigh for the cost and pain—
For the reed which grows nevermore again
As a reed with the reeds in the river."

Nothing can be farther from the truth than this. The morbid poets, spoilt as to their manhood, have invariably some physical defect,—a distorted foot perhaps, or a bad digestion. Their tempers would have been just as bad if they had not been poets at all: but their wives and children would have been the only sufferers. The healthy poet does not look upon his faculty as a chronic disease. There was no moaning, no querulous egoism, about Homer, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Goëthe. But the sad stress of physical pain and languor and hopeless unrest suffices to excuse this occasional morbidness in Mrs. Browning. We know nothing more melancholy than the intense sadness of *My Heart and I*:—

"You see we're tired, my heart and I.
We dealt with books, we trusted men,
And in our own blood drench'd the pen,
As if such colours could not fly.
We walk'd too straight for fortune's end,
We loved too true to keep a friend;
At last we're tired, my heart and I."

Nor do we know anything more exquisitely expressive of the pining for rest which is felt by those who suffer perpetual pain than the poem which commences:—

"Of all the thoughts of God that are
Borne inward unto souls afar,
Along the Psalmist's music deep,
Now tell me if that any is,
For gift or grace, surpassing this—
'He giveth his beloved sleep.'"

These *Last Poems* vary greatly, some of them being quite equal to Mrs. Browning's best previous efforts. *Little Mattie*, a poem on the death of a child of thirteen, is deprived of pathos by the strain after effect:—

"She has seen the mystery hid
Under Egypt's pyramid:
By those eyelids pale and close
Now she knows what Rhamses knows."

These are not the natural thoughts of a mother whose child lies dead; nor indeed would they occur to the most philosophic and indifferent bystander. "What Rhamses knows" we can hardly venture to conjecture, seeing that he died about thirty centuries ago, if we are to believe in Bunsen's Chronology; but the notion that the child by immediate insight has obtained all conceivable knowledge is simply grotesque. We do not, indeed, consider Mrs. Browning generally happy in treating of the love of children. She was rather amative than philoprogenitive. The humorous simplicity of the next poem, *A False Step*, is perfectly charming:—

"Sweet, thou hast trod on a heart,
Pause, there's a world full of men;
And women as fair as thou art
Must do such things now and then."

But the poet predicts some retributive regret in the future:—

"Thou'lt sigh, very like, on thy part,
Of all I have known or can know,
I wish I had only the heart
I trod upon years ago."

In *Lord Walter's Wife*, Mrs. Browning touches a topic that were better left alone. The lady strives to detain a

friend of her husband's who is going because he finds her "far too fair." She carries this so far that he angrily declares she is fair no longer, but "ugly and hateful." Thereupon she lectures him for having dared to love her, and analyses, with rather too much detail, the way in which some men are apt to treat their friends' wives. What can be more mournful than to find a lady writing such a couplet as this?—

"You did me the honour, perhaps to be moved at my side now and then
In the senses—a vice, I have heard, which is common to beasts
and some men."

Bianca among the Nightingales was probably suggested by Mr. Tennyson's *Mariana*. It is the soliloquy of an Italian lady deserted in England by her English lover, and greatly fretted by the song of the nightingales. Those whom a great grief has brought low are apt to exaggerate the minor annoyances of life; and, as Mariana's weariness was aggravated when "the blue fly sung i' the pane," so Bianca's misery is made more miserable by the ceaseless chant of the nightingales. The lyric is full of power and passion, though evidently original.

Amy's Cruelty is a second excellent specimen of Mrs. Browning's delicate humour.

De Profundis is a noble poem:—

"The face which, duly as the sun,
Rose up for me with life begun,
To mark all bright hours of the day
With hourly love is dimm'd away—
And yet my days go on, go on."

The sad cadence of this poem is exquisite. But the sadness finds relief:—

"A voice reproves me thereupon . . .
God's voice, not Nature's."

And the result is consolation in the great misery—hope awakened amid despair:—

"I praise Thee while my days go on;
I love Thee while my days go on:
Through dark and dearth, through fire and frost,
With emptied arms and treasure lost,
I thank Thee while my days go on."

Had Mrs. Browning always written like this she might have won the crown of a Christian poetess.

To the poem of Pan among the reeds, and the "blinding sweet" music which he made on the banks of Ladou, we have already referred. It is curious that the poetess has falsified the myth, and caused the Arcadian god to make a poet "out of a man," whereas it is known that he found his material in the reed to which the fugitive nymph Syrinx was turned.

Political poems and translations close the volume. The former are quite as illogical and abrupt as the *Poems before Congress*. Mrs. Browning's Napoleon-worship is strong as ever. Some of the rhymes are atrocious; *ex. gr.*—

"Azeglio, Farini, Mamiani,
Ricasoli—doubt by the dozen!—here's
Pepoli, too, and Cipriani,
Imperial cousins and cozeners."

Again:—

"Yes, write down the two as compeers,
Confessing (you would not *permet a lie*)
He bore up his Piedmont ten years,
Till she suddenly smiled and was *Italy*."

A View across the Roman Campagna is better, though too nearly approaching profanity. There is a certain sublimity in the conception:—

"Over the dumb Campagna-Sea,
Out in the offing through mist and rain,
Saint Peter's Church heaves silently
Like a mighty ship in pain,
Facing the tempest with struggle and strain."

But the latter part of the poem treats sacred persons with too much of the irreverent familiarity which has made *The Biglow Papers* notorious. Mrs. Browning did not know where to stop.

The character and career of our poetess should be closely studied by any young writers of the female sex

who desire to become famous. Let them learn how her restless ambition injured her renown, by inducing her to choose unpoetic subjects, and to treat them unpoetically. Let them compare their own power with hers, and, seeing how far short she fell of high success, let them consider whether it were not more wise to seek in calmer and less exciting occupations the true happiness which to women is more needful than fame.

Dean Ramsay on the Christian Life.



WHEN a writer attempts to tread in the steps of the great masters of the saintly life he may be pardoned if his puny efforts fail to keep pace with their gigantic strides; but, at the same time, he must not think it hard if he is judged by a severer standard than less aspiring authors. Now, the title of the present book at once claims for it rank in the highest class of Christian literature. It recalls *The Memorial of a Christian Life*, by Luiz of Granada, *The Devout Life of S. Francis de Sales*, and a host of others.

Unfortunately, however, it has this defect—it bears little or no relation to the contents. It might possibly be called *Sketches of Christian Character under certain Aspects*, but even then the outlines are too rough, and too much like caricature to be pleasing. The title is clearly a mistake; but even this might be excused if it were atoned for by anything like quick and accurate perception of character in the particular line which has been chosen; but there is nothing of the kind. Writing, as the author evidently does, with the very best intentions, his theology falls painfully below the level of his subject. The volume, therefore, will be a disappointment to any one who, beguiled by the title, hopes to find in it a truthful delineation of Christian character, or an attempt to unfold the dark and manifold workings of the human heart. And this is just what might be expected from the occasional glimpses we get of the author's course of reading. In his preface he professes to go no higher than "the great writers of English theology," which, from other parts of the book, we learn to be mostly Puritan. His text-books are Scougal's *Life of God in the Soul*, Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, Allein's *Alarm to the Unconverted*, and others of the same stamp. His admiration is principally for Baxter, Howe, Owen, Watts, Wesley, Carey, and the like. He has conceived a high idea of Milton's system of theology, and wonders that people do not drink deeper from such an inspiring source. Now, we have no right to quarrel with the Dean's taste, but we do demur at his making a compilation from Puritan writings, shorn, however, of all their quaint humour, and calling it by the ill-assorted title of his book.

When we come to examine what the author understands by "means of grace," his peculiar line of thought and study stands out in bold relief. At page 10 he seems to sum them up as "the utterances of God's word"—hearing the exhortation of Christian ministers—reading religious books—the discipline of affliction, sickness, and sorrow—the warnings of advancing age—the recollection of a father's instruction, and the fond remembrance of a mother's prayers and a mother's tears. These, he assures us, are "the immediate causes of men becoming earnest Christians." But what has become of the sacraments?

Archbishop Laud is most needlessly dragged in, to supply the dark background to one of the author's highly-coloured pictures:—

"He would have called down fire from heaven," we are told, "had the power been given to him. He stands in the character of the elder brother, when the question is to pardon."

The admirers of the Archbishop will scarcely thank the

* *The Christian Life in its Origin, Progress, and Perfection*. By E. B. Ramsay, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Dean of the Diocese of Edinburgh. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

Dean for this hideous sketch, and a little reflection may perhaps convince him that such a painful distortion is hardly needed, even to exhibit by contrast the beauty of his Puritans.

But it is tiresome to go on. It is the fashion of the present day to dabble in theology. Some even of our statesmen do not disdain to crown their other high distinctions with the honours of a *dilettanti* degree in divinity. The mischief seems to be growing. It threatens to become gigantic. Such books as that before us help to encourage the evil. Lacking all theological precision, they yet aspire to a degree of dogmatism which is worthy of a better cause. But, much as we may respect their author's motives, we cannot applaud the result. If people, with little more knowledge of theology as a science than may be picked up from the odds and ends of Non-conformist "divines," persist in thrusting their unripe opinions upon the public, they must be content to have it said of them, that they may be very well-meaning men in their way, but can scarcely expect us to respect their theology.

Dr. Cumming.*



LD John Murray used to say that "every man had a book in him;" the only difficulty being to decide what that book was, and to get it written. The *dictum* was as true as such broad assertions ever are; but Dr. Cumming is an exception to the general rule. In no sense can he be called a man *unius libri*, seeing that once in every month or six weeks he gives us a new volume, of some such light and trivial kind as a *Commentary on the Gospels*, an *Explanation of the Apocalypse*, an *Answer to Reviews and Essays*, or *The Great Tribulation*.

Prolific is a word not half strong enough to express his marvellous fecundity. It seems no more effort to him to produce a volume than to a sponge when squeezed to yield moisture; and the result in either case is about equally valuable, a poor watery deposit, which no one but the original cares to take up again. As the flavour of the celebrated Mr. Tupper's works is one and uniform throughout—Solomon and water in a state of placid solution or mild effervescence,—so is it with the learned Divine of Crown Court. Such are the coincidences of genius. In *The Millennial Rest* we have the same mixture of fine writing, tawdry rhetoric, scraps of pretended learning, and inflated bombast, as in all his former outpourings. Once more we have reckless assertions made to do duty for logic, the same intolerable egotism, the same condescending patting on the back of scholars and divines who chance on some point of trivial detail to agree with him, the same unscrupulous condemnation where they happen to differ. On all subjects, human and divine, on all epochs, past, present, or future, on all men, living or dead, Pope Cumming issues his infallible edicts with an audacity well becoming the proudest occupants of that throne which he regards with such pious horror.

This would be intolerable on any subject; but when applied to one of the grandest which can occupy mortal thoughts, the glories of that future world of which the loftiest intellect can form no adequate conception, the unseen land of which no traveller has returned to tell, but which the saints and confessors of every age since Christ trod the earth have made the subject of their solemn prayers and holiest aspirations,—then such treatment rises to a climax which we do not care to characterize as it deserves. When a man has built a house of tinsel, straw, and feathers, and solemnly proclaims it to be a mansion of stone founded on the rock, which his disciples behold with wonder and admiration, to argue the point either with the builder or his allies is simply a waste of time and labour.

* *The Millennial Rest; or, The World as it will be.* By Rev. John Cumming, D.D., &c. &c. Bentley. 1862.

Just such a structure is the volume before us, concerning which it is idle to enter into any serious argument or point of controversy. We are not, therefore, about to reason with Dr. Cumming as to the number of the *Beast*, the dates of special Antichrists, the exact meaning of the *Three Frogs*, or any other similar topics. All we propose to do is to show to him and to his admirers some few specimens of the feathers, tinsel, and straw, as they appear to the rest of the world when removed from the blazing glare of his eloquence to the sober light of reality.

From the chapter, entitled *Patches of Sunshine*, let us take a sample of good taste and eloquence in expounding Isa. lxi. 10 :—

"What is the first song of the thrush, the first musical whistle of the blackbird? It is that creature's happiness overflowing in song to Him that made it. What are the violets of spring but earth praising God? Did you ever read Coleridge's sublime hymn, written in the valley of Chamounix on the side of the Alps, where he represents all nature lifting up a ceaseless anthem peal to God? Why should we put on crape and ashes when creation tries to put on her bridal robes? . . . Are blackbirds happier than Christians? Are flowers more beautiful than robes of righteousness that are washed and made white? What are we? &c. &c. &c."

This sort of thing is continued for some eight or ten pages, and might easily be continued for 800 more. But what is easy writing to the Doctor is hard reading to us, so we will be merciful in the matter of extract, simply observing that the above series of questions, and the other eight similar pages, are intended to be in explanation of the text, "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, &c." Some of the questions the Doctor has answered for himself; some of the others we will briefly answer for him. We have read Coleridge's hymn in the Valley of Chamouni and found in it what is not to be found in any part of the *Patches of Sunshine*, viz. great grandeur and solemnity of thought, eloquence, great reverence for his subject, and entire oblivion of self. Blackbirds are *not* happier than Christians. The happiness of a bird and a Christian are so utterly unlike, both in nature and in degree, that no comparison between them can be made. The one is the joyous instinct of an animal, the other is the glad utterance of an immortal spirit, if he be any better than a loquacious parrot. To compare these two things is as utterly absurd as to ask if earthly flowers which we see, smell, and touch, are fairer than that unseen, spiritual robe which is to clothe the Christian when made perfect in heaven. The same bad taste, the same love of tawdry sentiment, leads the writer of this poor stuff to say, at p. 312 :—

"There are but two material things in this world that are perfectly beautiful; the flowers of summer, and the everlasting flowers that we call diamonds and amethysts, gems and jewels . . . Is it lawful to wear these things? It is perfectly lawful if you have paid for them, and it is certainly beautiful to do so."

It may be here asked, What has such balderdash as this to do with *The Millennial Rest*? All we can reply is that nine-tenths of the book is made up of this kind of thing, and that it is believed in and relished by the Doctor's disciples as eloquence, divinity, and poetry of the highest kind.

Our next extract must be a longer one, from the chapter entitled *The Binding of Satan*; but as the ground trodden in this chapter, and the topics treated of, are mainly the same as those forming the groundwork of the other chapters, our readers must not be surprised at finding that extract to have nothing to do with the matter in hand. The Doctor has been speculating, as usual, as to the meaning and extent of the Resurrection, and of the locality of Heaven; he then decides, as he has again and again done, that an interval of a thousand years shall elapse between the first and second Resurrection; and agrees with Dr. Chalmers that Heaven is—

"Not a place but a condition, it is the spirits of the believers in a state of perfect happiness, immediately contemplating and seeing Christ; but who can say that there may not be a stratum of such spirits, as it were, above where we now are? I think there is reason to believe that the spirits of those who have entered into glory are neither unconscious nor ignorant of what is transacting on earth. But whether

conscious or unconscious, it is not necessary to believe that they are materially geographically remote, but merely that they are conditionally distinct from and superior to the state in which we Christians struggling here now are. Between the people in the crypt of a cathedral, where all is cold, damp, and dark, and the people worshipping on the floor of the cathedral, there is but the thickness of a flagstone two or three inches thick; yet the conditions are totally different; and the one has no connection with the other, unless when a door opens, and one ascends, and a flash of the celestial splendour breaks in, and a few notes of the heavenly song are heard; but with that exception the two conditions are perfectly distinct and separate from each other. I have never been able to read otherwise that beautiful allusion in the twelfth chapter of Hebrews; and if I were alone in my interpretation I should hesitate; but I find the ablest Greek critics—and one of the ablest is the present Dean of Canterbury, Dean Alford—concur in what I think is its true solution, 'seeing we are surrounded with so great a cloud of witnesses.' What is a cloud? It is the effect of the sun's heat that has taken up water or steam from the earth, and fixed it in what seems to us a thick mass, but what is really a body of thin vapour, waiting for the cold wind to touch and to condense it. Seeing we are surrounded by a cloud, a company, of those who have been exhaled or raised from the earth by the fervour of the Sun of Righteousness, 'let us run with patience the race set before us, looking unto Jesus.'—P. 47.

In this long and ornate passage the beauties crowd upon us so thickly that the difficulty is to decide where or what to choose first. The pudding is all plums; or, as Mr. Tupper might remark—

"When beauties too numerous crowd on thy senses bewilder'd,
'Tis hard to decide. O, beware then, and choose thou the fairest!
The strongest temptation will have thee."

On the whole, we incline to give the first place to the scholar-like inquiry into the meaning of the word "cloud," physical and metaphysical; after which we will glance briefly through the whole of the splendid paragraph which precedes it, and note the beauties which it contains.

In the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews the Apostle, as every one knows, expatiates very grandly on the word "faith" and its most illustrious examples; and having cited these, he begins his next paragraph with the well-known words:—"Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run the race, &c." A passage so pre-eminently clear and simple that every school-boy of sixteen who reads his Greek Testament, and every pupil-teacher who reads it in English, would have no difficulty in showing the plain meaning, which every child of ten years old would understand at a glance. "The cloud of witnesses" simply being the vast number of the faithful in all past ages, whose spirits are still near the scene of their former conflict on earth, and watch in silent sympathy the struggles of their brethren still in the flesh. There is no obscurity, doubt, or difficulty in the whole passage; and this, therefore, is the very place for the Doctor to overwhelm us with the following revelation, of which we number the successive stages:—

"(1.) Heaven is not a place but a condition. (2.) *It is the spirits of believers in a state of happiness.* (3.) Of which there may be a *stratum* above us; (4.) not geographically remote; (5.) between the people in the crypt and those on the floor of a cathedral there is but a flagstone; (6.) with no connection between them but when one ascends, and a flash of light or song breaks in; (7.) as St. Paul shows by his use of the word *cloud*; (8.) a cloud is the effect of the sun's heat, that has taken up water or steam; (9.) and fixed it in a mass waiting for wind to touch and condense it; (10.) the cloud (spiritual) is a company of those exhaled from earth by the fervour of the Sun of Righteousness, &c. &c."

Any English dictionary would have shown him that a "cloud" simply means a crowd, a multitude; any school-boy would have told him that *népos* simply means the very same thing, as where Homer says, (out of many examples):—

"*Ἄμα δὲ νέφος ἕρπτο πέζων* :

and Virgil imitates by the words *nimbus peditum*. But this would not at all have answered the Doctor's purpose, which is to impress his hearers with a vast notion of his acquaintance with natural philosophy, of his scholarship, and with his intention to approve of Dean Alford as one of the ablest Greek critics. Dr. Cumming has nothing new, and nothing worth hearing to say; but it is hard that he must expand his nothing into an acre of gossip alike unworthy

of himself and of the subject he professes to be explaining.

It is useless to tell such a writer that if heaven, according to his own showing, be a condition, it cannot be the spirits in that condition; that *stratum* is a word applied not to a living multitude in active motion, but to a body as a whole at rest; that there are no *people* in the crypt of a cathedral, but only the lifeless ashes; that the music and the light are not below but above, so that neither sound nor light must flash downwards, but up through the open door, of which he speaks with his usual obscurity.

This paragraph from Lecture IV. may be taken as a fair sample of the whole book, which contains upwards of twenty lectures, and more than 500 pages. The Doctor's style is uniformly excellent; marked by the same beauties, adorned with the same grace. At the opening of each discourse he rises to the same lofty height of eloquence, and from this he rarely descends till he reaches the last word of the final peroration. All difficulty, therefore, as to *choice* of extracts, if more be needed, is removed; but by the same law all necessity for making any more is also removed—*ex pede Herculem*! If, before taking leave of this great scholar and theologian, we indulge in a few more choice morsels from his well-crowned board, it is that our paper may sparkle to the last, and after such an opening bear our readers pleasantly to the end. After our previous quotations, it is not surprising to find the Doctor telling us such graceful and profound truths as these, (which are culled at random):—

"The future is not, I repeat, an ethereal, impalpable, imponderable, metaphysical thing, but a new and bright heaven; an enveloping, holy, happy, brilliant, joyous atmosphere."

Then we read, on the same page, of the Divine Being who is the King and Creator of that heaven, that—

"He did not make our headaches and our heartaches, our grey-hairs, and the crow's feet about the eye, and decay, deformity, and infirmity."

This is quite in our author's style, but in the next line he outsoars himself, fairly out-cumminging Cumming:—

"*All these*," he adds, "the headaches, the heartaches, the grey-hairs, the crow's feet about the eyes, *all these things will be made a present of to the devil!*"

We make no comment on this choice and elegant passage, but simply remark that it occurs in the lecture entitled *The First Resurrection*, to which grand subject it is clearly well-fitted. Having announced that men who attain the glory of the eternal life shall be no more troubled with headache, heartache, or crow's feet round the eyes, it will be satisfactory to know that "the future is not a series of cold, insulated cells;" and that the inhabitants will not be shut up in stone and lonely cells, when the curse—

"Like a stain of ink upon the blotting-paper, has radiated over all the surface of nature and struck down to its very heart!"

One more extract, and we have done. In this novel and original style he expatiates on the words, "There shall be no more death," when comparing the unseen glory of the world to come with "the Exposition of all Nations":—

"The most beautiful creations in this exhibition," we are told, "decay; there is rust on the purest gold; tarnish on steel; a worm in the cedar; a moth in the costly robes; the purple of Tyre, the cunning hands, are all gone; Phœnicians and artisans of Memphis; looms of Sidon; workshops of Nineveh; creations of Cambyzes, &c.; whose factories" (a new fact) "filled the whole Valley of the Euphrates." Then follow:—"Venice, blades of Toledo, Damascus, Verbruggen, Brussels, Valenciennes; Murillo, Raphael, Carlo Dolce, Titian, Praxiteles, Canova; death, decomposition, and decay are carrying on their processes everywhere, while we are expressing to our neighbours the admiration that we feel as we view those wonderful structures."

It is obvious that in the hands of a man who gravely prints froth of this kind, and counts it suitable to such solemn realities as the resurrection, eternal life, the judgment, and eternal death, no subject however high, mysterious, or holy, is safe. "The great multitude which no man could number, &c. &c.," with all its awful and glorious solemnity, is to him simply a passage which Burns—

"Great for his exquisite thoughts, could never read without tears trickling down his cheeks;" there is "enough in the photograph taken by the sunbeams of the Sun of Righteousness, to move, to fascinate, and charm."

In a word, the whole subject of *The Millennial Rest* is simply regarded as a field for idle speculation, for irreverent trifling with holy things, for tawdry sentimentalism, and for proclaiming its author as the prophet of the age. Of his good sense and taste every page furnishes numberless examples; his scholarship is apparent in such facts as shutting the Temple of Janus in time of war, or placing Persepolis in the Valley of the Euphrates; and his charity by his belief "that there are no Roman Catholics in heaven," (p. 378,) and that while every variety of dissent shall find its way to that blessed place, no one modern divine of the Church of England is named in his list of "The citizens of New Jerusalem."

Books of this kind, however, attain a certain amount of popularity among readers and disciples of a certain class; that sort of popularity which rightly belongs to high-flown romances. And this conviction, we imagine, must have led the Doctor's publishers to advertise this precious tome as having *all the charm of a novel without its illusions*. It would be difficult to express a tithe of the mischief caused by pages of profane and silly babbling such as those of *The Millennial Rest*.

Recent Fiction.



WHATEVER may be the cause, it is undeniable that the supply of indifferent fiction is wholly in excess of the demand for good. It is now only very rarely thought worth while to give a grievance the distinction of coming before the world in a volume by itself. Every social disfigurement is made conspicuous in the pages of a novel; and people who have a particularly serious "purpose" to proclaim almost invariably find their readiest medium in romance. It would be, however, remarkable that so many of these disguised treatises upon the morals of the times should so soon be put to tempt the subscribers of the circulating libraries from an uncut pile "reduced in price," were it not tolerably well known how the drug gets on the market. The truth is that there are publishers who notoriously encourage the publication of splendid sentiments, which are not on the whole appreciated if they are not in three volumes. A manuscript may even reveal a new religion, or shadow out a new Church, and show how the novelty can best be worked; but the publisher, it is most probable, has very little soul beyond the consideration of how much space the idea is likely to occupy; and it is, certainly, not every benevolent discovery that can with ease accommodate itself to the best-selling standard. There might be some reasonable hope that the evil would cure itself if the number of volumes did not so materially govern the development of the story. The fiction that eventuates in a mild catastrophe in three hundred pages is transformed, at least, into a tragedy when it is required to be trebled, as the first condition of the publisher; and the recognized sensualist, who may be merely vicious in one volume, becomes a revolting caricature when he is drawn into three. Half the novels that are written are required to fulfil no other condition than that of being "thirty-one and sixpence." Their production has become a trade, and the publisher does not very considerably concern himself about the credit of his attenuated publication when he looks in his ledger to the credit side of the account.

It was, perhaps, conceived that the materials for the highway business were exhausted when the late Mr. G. P. R. James discovered that nothing new could be got out of a "palfrey;" and the element that afterwards came to be introduced was that of clerical life. There seems to be no reason why such a field should ever cease to be worked. Mr. Trollope and others have done very well for themselves

by inviting their readers' to the reflection that some of the weaknesses of human nature are to be found within parsonages; and the discovery has been so variously illustrated that a writer who confessedly knows nothing about the clergy has accidentally not always exaggerated. The novels of George Eliot have followed in the same direction, and Miss Sewell and Miss Yonge have never spoiled their admirable tales by pushing into undue prominence any particular purpose. The Tractarian movement has had its history told in fiction, and even the novels that have praised Lord Palmerston's bishops have not invariably been particularly dull or particularly "lofty." It has, indeed, been evidenced that in this sort of way Church principles may be served or attacked. *High Church* and *No Church* were actively circulated by the Nonconformists; and *Miriam May* and *Crispin Ken* were put on the *index expurgatorius* of Mr. Mudie. Nor does the supply of church fiction seem likely to cease. *The Valley of the Maude*,* by Mrs. Stewart, is not only very good, but quite that lady's best. Indeed, since the admirable author of the *Heir of Redclyffe* is not to be persuaded from over-writing herself, there is consolation in the consciousness that Mrs. Stewart, one of Miss Yonge's most valuable coadjutors in many of her serials, has not yet given us all her power. *The Valley of the Maude* shows a great advance on *Atheline*, and there is no reason why Mrs. Stewart should not write up to *Heartsease* yet. There is with this lady no striving after effect, no irksome obtrusion of purpose, and nothing in her style to weary; and there are few book clubs, or general circles, to which the *Valley of the Maude* may not be profitably commended. The republication of Mrs. S. C. Hall's last magazine contribution will probably only suggest the inquiry as to why it was ever written; nor will criticism be relieved when it is pointed out that it might have been worse, for it might have been in three volumes. *Can Wrong be Right?*† can only be described as a "sensation" novel, full of inappropriate scriptural allusions. There is, moreover, brain-fever, and small-pox, and a very sudden marriage indeed; and the possibility of wrong being right never achieves any excitement in the hands of such a moralist as Mrs. S. C. Hall. It is always very clear that the end will be a great triumph for virtue; and that expectation should be realized only shows how much of this sort of patronage virtue can stand. In the matter of parenthesis, however, the book is a marvel; and the printer's establishment must have been put to it to find the ways and means to involve all the sentences up to Mrs. Hall's instructions. *The Dream of a Life*‡ is not Lady Scott's best; but the difficulty of writing a tolerable "fashionable" novel is not easy to overcome. As a love-story, and nothing more, it has been very effectively treated, and has not been troubled with a rival this season. But the *Skeleton in the Cupboard* was so good that Lady Scott has herself discovered a standard which her readers will insist upon her always reaching. As it is, she tells the story of a young girl's affection being directed in the matrimonial market, by her mother, in the usual way, always with originality, and often with power.

There is some cause to fear that Mrs. Wood has not calculated the consequences of becoming a speculation in the hands of publishers; and it would be satisfactory if a clever writer could resist the temptation of getting up a story merely to relieve the dulness of the book-trade this season. We believe that this lady is now engaged on three separate tales, and, it may be, has offers for as many more. *The Channings*§ is a third-rate novel that appeared at first in a serial form, and would never have been delivered from obscurity had not the success of *East Lynne* made the rescue a profitable one. *The Channings* is the talk of the country only because it is by the author of *East Lynne*; there is nothing else that can account for its selling in thousands. At the same time Mrs. Wood tells a story, that is only an

* *The Valley of the Maude*. By Mrs. Stewart, authoress of *Atheline*; or, *The Castle by the Sea*; Saunders, Otley, and Co.

† *Can Wrong be Right?* By Mrs. S. C. Hall; Hurst and Blackett.

‡ *The Dream of a Life*. By Lady Scott; Saunders, Otley, and Co.

§ *The Channings*. By Mrs. Henry Wood, author of *East Lynne*; Bentley.

indifferent one, better than most people can tell a good one. *The Channings* is another proof of her power to keep a secret from her readers whilst she keeps up their suspense; and she is, at least, able to present a fiction that is not unattractive, about nothing much more "sensational" than the mysterious disappearance of 20l. Mrs. Wood could, very likely, afford just now to write a bad novel; but if she can only be advised to dismiss the offers to write anything "on her own terms," she may yet contribute a novel that will live.

Mrs. Briscoe does not entirely satisfy us in *A Woman's Life*.* There is a want of arrangement in the chief features of the story, and the title-page is, perhaps, the most attractive part of her undertaking; but there is a kindliness about this lady that would get an introduction for a much inferior fiction. *A Woman's Life* is always pleasant reading, for it tells us something of the heart of the writer, and the worst that can be said of it is, that Mrs. Briscoe does not always write up to her subject.

* *A Woman's Life*. By Mrs. Briscoe; Saunders, Otley, and Co.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We cannot undertake to return communications.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

WANTED a HOME for the HOLI-DAYS, beginning the middle of August, by a Lady who fills the position of Governess in a Clergyman's family. She will devote four hours in the day to teaching, act as companion to a Lady, or take charge of a family, in return for a comfortable home for four weeks, or longer, in a Clergyman's or Gentleman's family. Address, H. C. 30, Care of Messrs. Saunders and Otley, 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square. W.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced TUTORs, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M. A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

Royal Asylum of St. Anne's Society.

Brixton Hill, Surrey, and Aldersgate, London.

PATRONS.

THE QUEEN AND THE ROYAL FAMILY.

ITS Objects—Orphans or not—Children born in prosperity whose Parents (Clergymen, Solicitors, Surgeons, Naval or Military Officers, Merchants, or Traders) are now in adversity.

Its Universality—It has no local bounds—the Children of any country are eligible—3,000 have been succoured.

Its Advantages—Home, Clothing, Maintenance, and Education to 300.

Its Dependence—Voluntary Subscriptions and Donations.

Subscriptions gratefully received by Messrs. SPOONER, 27, Gracechurch Street, or by EDW. FRED. LEEKS, Secretary. Office, 2, Walbrook, E. C.

STUDY of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE, PUBLIC READING, &c.—The Rev. ALEX. J. D'ORSEY, Lecturer in English History at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, will give Public Lectures and Private Lessons at the City of London College for two months, commencing 9th of June. Programme at 186, Fleet Street.

C. C. Coll., Cambridge, 21 May.

D'ORSEY'S "STUDY of the ENGLISH LANGUAGE an ESSENTIAL PART of a UNIVERSITY COURSE," a Lecture delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain.

London: BELL AND DALDY.

THE HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its POLITICAL RELATIONS to EVENTS in EUROPE, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Thirteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain JAGER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. 8vo [Just ready.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Elegant Personal Requisites,

Under the Patronage of Royalty and the Aristocracy of Europe.

ROWLANDS' MACASSAR OIL.

This Elegant and Fragrant Oil possesses extraordinary properties for promoting the growth, restoring, preserving, and beautifying the Human Hair. Price, 3s. 6d.; 7s.; 10s. 6d. (equal to four small); and 21s. per Bottle.

ROWLANDS' KALYDOR.

Realizes a HEALTHY PURITY of Complexion, and a softness and delicacy of Skin. Soothing, cooling, and purifying, it eradicates all Cutaneous Eruptions, Freckles, Tan, and Discolourations. Price, 4s. 6d. and 8s. 6d. per Bottle.

ROWLANDS' ODONTO,

Or Pearl Dentrifice.

Compounded of Oriental Ingredients—it imparts a Pearl-like whiteness to the Teeth, eradicates Tartar and Spots of incipient decay, strengthens the Gums, and gives a pleasing fragrance to the Breath. Price, 2s. 9d. per box.

Sold at 20, Hatton Garden, London, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

Ask for "ROWLANDS'" Articles.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.—HARRY EMANUEL, JEWELLER, SILVERSMITH, &c., to the QUEEN, begs to inform the Public that his DISPLAY of JEWELLERY will be found at his TROPHY in the Nave, opposite the entrance from the Horticultural Gardens; and his SHOW of PLATE in Class 33, adjoining the Pottery Court.

CAUTION.—HARRY EMANUEL, JEWELLER, SILVERSMITH, &c., to the QUEEN, begs to caution all persons against making or selling any articles infringing on his new Patent for "IVORY JEWELLERY;" and also against any imitation of his Registered "WINE COOLER." He begs, likewise, to inform the Public that he has no Agents for the Sale of the above-mentioned Goods, which are to be obtained only at his Establishment, 21, HANOVER SQUARE, 70, 71, BROOK STREET.

WHEATSTONE'S HARMONIUMS (English), in solid oak cases, manufactured by them, have the full compass of keys, are the best quality of tone, best workmanship and material, and do not require tuning. *Guineas.*
New Patent, five octaves, from CC, double pedals 6
(The best and cheapest Harmonium made.)
One Stop, oak case (reduced price) 9
Piccolo Piano Model, one Stop, polished (unique wind indicator) 10
(With soft and distinct tones, and projecting finger-board.)
Two Stops, one set and a-half of vibrators (polished case) 12
(The extra upper half-set of vibrators adds wonderfully to the effect of the treble, and produces a beautiful diapason-like quality of sound.)
Three Stops, large size, organ tones (polished case) 15
Five Stops, two sets of vibrators, ditto 22
Eight Stops, two sets of vibrators, ditto 24
Ten Stops, three sets of vibrators, ditto 30
(The best and most effective instrument made.)

For particular description of the above, and other Harmoniums in rosewood and mahogany cases, see Messrs. Wheatstone and Co.'s Illustrated Catalogue, which may be had of them gratis and post free on application.

(The only Exhibition Prize Medalist for Harmoniums, 1851.)

An extensive Assortment of French Harmoniums by Alexandre (including all the latest improvements) at prices from 5 guineas to 150 guineas.

WHEATSTONE and Co., Inventors and Patentees of the Concertina,

20, Conduit Street, Regent Street, London.

The Original Manufacturers and Importers of Harmoniums.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free. Also, ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3l. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

WINE for the HOLY COMMUNION.

After long and careful search for a PURE SACRAMENTAL WINE, a few casks of very choice and rich "St. Martin," Malaga, landed in 1839, have been secured as possessing every indispensable quality, and will be disposed of exclusively for this sacred use. Price 50s. per dozen, cash. Best Rota Tent, 42s. per dozen. Orders must be accompanied with a remittance. GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, &c., London, E. C.; and Park Row, Greenwich, S. E.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY. Capital 100,000l. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

The Conservative Land Society.

INVESTMENTS can be made either in the Share or Deposit departments, with prompt withdrawal when required. The Interest allowed is five per cent. per annum on Share, and four per cent. on Deposits, paid half-yearly. No partnership liability, and the taking of land is quite optional. Depositors do not become shareholders, and the latter only participate in any profits above the guaranteed Interest. The society has paid from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 per cent. to Shareholders, and they have received $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the past year. Prospectuses explanatory of the Share, Deposit, and Land Departments, will be sent free of charge and postage to any part of the world. Plots of land for sale in 18 Counties, giving the freehold franchise, and securing a safe investment.

CHARLES LEWIS GUINNESS, Secretary,
33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.
12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE.

An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

NOISELESS CARRIAGES. Messrs.

OFFORD invite inspection of their PATENT PERFECT INDIA-RUBBER TYRES, GLASS FRAMES, PANELS, SPRING BLOCKS, SHACKLES, SELF-ACTING STEPS, IRON WHEELS, &c., which decrease the weight, increase the comfort and durability, and entirely prevent the disagreeable noise experienced in all close carriages.

BROUGHAMS in Six Sizes, also extra light and strong for medical men and hilly countries.

LANDAUS, BAROUCHES, SOCIABLES, CLARENCES, &c.
Patentees, 79, Wells Street, Oxford Street.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

Vintage Wine Company.

IMPORTERS OF SPANISH WINES.

XERES COMIDA SHERRY,
Soft, Fine Body, Age, and Flavour.

"A marvel of purity and cheapness."—*See Press.*

Golden, 18s.; Pale, 20s. per dozen,

Samples for 1s. 6d.

Hampers of Two Dozen carriage paid to any Railway Station.

VINTAGE WINE COMPANY,
14, Bloomsbury Street, London.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.
H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

The Library Company, Limited.

FOR THE CIRCULATION OF ENGLISH, FOREIGN, AND COLONIAL LITERATURE.

Single Subscription: Half-a-guinea per annum.

No work of general interest is, on any pretence whatever, excluded from the Library. Blank registers are kept in which Subscribers may enter the names of New Books not in the Collection, and these will be invariably furnished in numbers sufficiently ample to prevent the slightest disappointment or delay.

There is a liberal supply of Reviews and Magazines, including the Revue des Deux Mondes, and other foreign publications of a like character.

By order,

FRANK FOWLER, Secretary.

CENTRAL OFFICES:

25, PALL MALL, & 30, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE.

CROSSES of every Material and Pattern.

PHOTOGRAPHS, all Schools and Sizes. Parcels for selection are sent post-free on receipt of 5s., 10s., or 20s.

LECTERN or PULPIT BOOK-MARKS, Mediæval patterns.

Catalogues posted for one stamp.

S. B. BEAL, 11, Paternoster Row, E.C.

THE CHURCH REVIEW is now firmly established

as a Weekly Church Paper. It is devoted to the maintenance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, and it seeks to increase the interest which English Churchmen are everywhere beginning to take in these great questions, and to call forth their energies in the Church's sacred cause.

Published every Saturday morning at 2, York Street, Covent Garden. Price 3d., or stamped, 4d.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

Now ready, price 1s. 6d. each, post free,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC

GALLERY. The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.

BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Moray and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickersteth, Mackenzie, Denison.

DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellicott, Jacobson, Sewell, Guthrie, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolff.

REVERENDS C. Kingsley, Vaughan, Bryan King, Hugh McNeile, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upton Richards, W. Gresley, J. Mackonochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. P. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Geyt, J. M. Believ, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Ware-

houses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that RICHARD LOADER and Co. have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E.C.

84,000l. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, Mr. STEPHENS, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

Important Works

By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.,
Dean of Westminster.

COMMENTARY on the EPISTLES to the SEVEN CHURCHES in ASIA. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. 8s. 6d.

NOTES on the PARABLES. Eighth Edit. 12s.

NOTES on the MIRACLES. Sixth Edit. 12s.

SERMONS PREACHED in WESTMINSTER ABBEY. Second Edition. 10s. 6d.

SYNONYMS of the NEW TESTAMENT. Fifth Edition. 5s.

FIVE SERMONS PREACHED BEFORE the UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE. 2s. 6d.

HULSEAN LECTURES. Two Series. Cheaper Edition. 5s.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S EXPOSITION of the SERMON on the MOUNT. With an Essay on St. Augustine as an Interpreter of Scripture. Second Edition, revised and improved. 7s.

The Essay separately, 3s. 6d.

On the AUTHORIZED VERSION of the NEW TESTAMENT, in Connection with some Recent Proposals for its Revision. Second Edition, enlarged. 7s.

On the STUDY of WORDS. Tenth Edition. 4s.

A SELECT GLOSSARY of ENGLISH WORDS used Formerly in Senses different from their Present. Second Edition. 4s.

ENGLISH, PAST and PRESENT. Fourth Edition. 4s.

On SOME DEFICIENCIES in our ENGLISH DICTIONARIES. Second Edition. 3s.

PROVERBS and their LESSONS. Fifth Edit. 3s.

JUSTYN MARTYR; and other Poems. Fifth Edition. 5s.

POEMS from EASTERN SOURCES, GENOVEVA, and other Poems. Second Edition. 5s. 6d.

ELEGIAC POEMS. Third Edition. 2s. 6d.

CALDERON'S LIFE'S & DREAM. The GREAT THEATRE of the WORLD. With an Essay on his Life and Genius. 4s. 6d.

By CHARLES J. ELLICOTT,
Dean of Exeter.

A CRITICAL and GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARY on St. Paul's Epistles.

1. Galatians. Second Edition, enlarged. 8s. 6d.
2. Ephesians. Second Edition, enlarged. 8s. 6d.
3. Pastoral Epistles. Second Edition, enlarged. 10s. 6d.
4. Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Second Edition. 10s. 6d.
5. Thessalonians. 7s. 6d.

The DESTINY of the CREATURE; and other Sermons, preached before the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. Post 8vo. 5s.

HISTORICAL LECTURES on the LIFE of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

The GREEK TESTAMENT. With Notes, Grammatical and Exegetical. By WILLIAM WEBSTER, M.A., late of King's College, London, and formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge; and WILLIAM FRANCIS WILKINSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Werburgh's, Derby, formerly Theological Tutor in Cheltenham College. Complete in 2 vols. 8vo. 2l. 4s.

Vol. I. The Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles. 1l.

Vol. II. The Epistles and the Apocalypse. 1l. 4s.

London: PARKER, SON, AND BOURN, West Strand.

*New Volume of Commentaries, by the Rev. JAMES FORD, A.M.,
Prebendary of Exeter.*

S. PAUL'S EPISTLE to the ROMANS. Illustrated from Divines of the Church of England. Demy 8vo., pp. 723. 12s.

By the same Author.

The FOUR GOSPELS and the ACTS of the APOSTLES. Illustrated, chiefly in the Doctrinal and Moral Sense, from Ancient and Modern Authors.

S. Matthew, pp. 588, 11s.

S. Mark, pp. 405, 9s.

S. Luke, pp. 684, 12s.

S. John, pp. 794, 13s.

Acts, pp. 792, 13s.

With Copious Indexes. Each Volume may be had separately.

HISTORY of the HOLY EASTERN CHURCH. General Introduction. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 2 Vols. 2l.

"Treats of the Geography, Ecclesiology, Liturgies, Calendar, &c. There is much of interest to the general reader, and the Author's well established reputation is guarantee that there is no lack of learned research."—*Ecclesiastic.*

"We must express our admiration of the research and indefatigable industry of the Author, and our high sense of the addition he has made to our theological literature in this very learned publication."—*English Review.*

The HISTORY of the PATRIARCHATE of ALEXANDRIA, By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 2 vols. 24s.

Contains its history and foundation from its apostolic founder, through the annals of its earlier patriarchs—The Persecutions and Martyrs—The Sabellian, Arian, and Nestorian Heresies, up to the time of Mahomet—Its Mediæval History and its Decline—The Great Gulf between East and West up to the present time, when it is a shadow of its former self, "persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed."

APPENDIX to the INTRODUCTION to the HISTORY of the HOLY EASTERN CHURCH; containing a List of the Sees. By the same Author. 1s.

DOCUMENTS CONNECTED with the PRESENT STATE and MISSIONS of the EASTERN CHURCH. Translated with Notes by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 5s.

Eight Essays are by M. A. N. Mouravieff, author of the History of the Russian Church; the Ninth by Innocent, late Archbishop of Odessa; and the Tenth is by an Athenian Priest.

The HISTORY of the COUNCIL of FLORENCE. Translated by EUGENE M. POPOFF; Edited by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. 5s.

An INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. By the Rev. ROBERT OWEN, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Oxford. 12s.

"A very learned and impartial Work; and is evidently the result of immense reading. A condensation of the whole body of Patristic Divines reduced with great skill into a system of Theology."—*Oxford Herald.*

"English Theology owes much to Mr. Owen for this valuable work."—*Literary Churchman.*

The THREE BOOKS of THEOPHILUS to AUTOLYCUS on the CHRISTIAN RELIGION. Translated, with Notes, by the Rev. W. B. FLOWER, B.A., of Magdalene College, Cambridge, English Chaplain at Baden Baden. 3s. 6d.

HISTORY and FATE of SACRILEGE. By Sir HENRY SPELMAN, Knight. New Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

"Reflects high credit on all parties concerned."—*English Churchman.*

"It is full of learning. An appeal to facts as testimony to the fixed principles of a sort of Divine Jurisprudence."—*Ecclesiastic.*

The SPIRIT of the CHURCH. A Selection of Articles from the "Ecclesiastic." Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A Contents may be had gratis.

"Most gladly would we see it in the hands of every one now preparing for Holy Orders."—*Oxford Herald.*

"They illustrate principles, and show the Sacramental Theory of the Church at work."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

"Contains many valuable papers, and in all of them much practical information is given."—*Clerical Journal.*

London: J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND Co's. Literary Announcements.

- VALIKANOW'S TRAVELS in CENTRAL ASIA.** Translated from the Russian, by Authority. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The ASIAN EXPEDITION.** Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers. [Ready.]
- The LIFE and TIMES of SIR JAMES GRAHAM.** By W. TORRENS M'CULLAGH. 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The AUSTRALIAN EXPEDITION; STUART's Explorations into Southern Australia.** 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The HISTORY of the BRITISH NAVY, from the Earliest Era to the Present Time.** By C. D. YONGE, Esq., Author of "The Life of the Duke of Wellington." 2 vols. royal 8vo. with Plates, &c. [In Preparation.]
- NIPHON and PECHILI; Impressions of Japan and the North of China.** By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo. Illustrated. [This month.]
- On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY.** By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. [This month.]
- The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS, from 1842 to 1862.** By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. [This month.]
- MEMOIRS of the SPEAKERS of the HOUSE of COMMONS.** By WILLIAM NATHANIEL MASSEY, Esq., M.P., Author of "The History of England during the Reign of George III.," and Chairman of Ways and Means.
- TALES of the OUT-SPAN; or, Adventures in the Wilds of Southern Africa.** By CAPTAIN DRAYSON. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- MADAME DE STAEL and the GRAND DUCHESS LOUISE.** A selection from the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Madame de Staël, and the Grand Duchess Louise and Saxe Weimer, from 1800 to 1817; together with a letter to Bonaparte, First Consul; and another to Napoleon, Emperor. In 8vo. [Ready.]
- The MARQUIS of DALHOUSIE'S ADMINISTRATION of BRITISH INDIA.** By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., of University College, Oxford. 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]
- LIFE on the NIGER; or the Journal of an African Trader.** [In Preparation.]
- The LIFE, TIMES, and WRITINGS of the BISHOP of EXETER.** By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, of 8. Mary Steps, Exeter, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." [In Preparation.]
- The POLITICAL LIFE of the EARL of DERBY.** 8vo. [Next month.]
- Some ACCOUNT of BRITISH COLUMBIA.** By the Venerable the ARCHDEACON of BRITISH COLUMBIA. 8vo.
- The HISTORY of the CATHOLIC CHURCH from the Day of Pentecost to the Present Time.** By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, of Sackville College. 4 vols. 8vo.
- The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY.** By the Author of "Miriam May" and "Crispin Ken." 8vo. [This month.]
- The LIFE and TIMES of LORD BOLINGBROKE.** [In Preparation.]
- The INFLUENCE of the CHURCH on the CIVILIZATION of the WORLD.** A Contribution to the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM LEE, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. In 2 vols. 8vo.
- FAITH and PEACE.** Being Answers to "Essays and Reviews" by Several Writers. With a Preface by the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON. 8vo. 12s.
- The CRUISE of the SAINT GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION.** [This month.]
- The RELATION of CHURCH and STATE, and the Nature and Effect of an Established Religion.** By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P.
- The LATITUDINARIANS.** A Chapter of Church History from the Accession of Archbishop Tillotson, in 1691, to the Death of Archdeacon Blackburne, in 1787. By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland.
- CALABRIA and the LIPARIAN ISLANDS in 1860.** 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The LIFE of the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.**
- The CHURCHES of the EAST.** By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
- HISTORICAL MEMOIRS of the SUCCESSORS of SAINT PATRICK, and the BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS of ARMAGH.** By JAMES HENTHORN TODD, D.D., F.S.A.; President of the Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. [In the Press.]
- The HISTORY of the CONSERVATIVE PARTY from the Defection of Sir Robert Peel to the Present Time.**
- ECCLESIA RESTITUTA.** By F. C. MASSINGBERD, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Ormsby.
- SERMONS by the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's Church, Wakefield, with a Memoir of his Life.** Edited by the BISHOP of BRECHIN.
- NORTHERN EUROPE.** Denmark, Sweden, Norway. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 2 vols. 8vo. [This month.]
- RICHARD COBDEN.** A Biography.
- The HISTORY of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, Player and Poet, with New Facts and Traditions.** By S. W. FULLOM, Author of "The Great Highway," &c.
- The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the Last Morocco War.** With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo. [Ready.]
- The HELIOTROPIUM; or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine.** Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Drexelius, by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [This month.]
- RECOLLECTIONS of LABRADOR LIFE.** 7s. 6d.
- The SHANNON'S BRIGADE in INDIA.** By EDMUND HOPE VERNY, R.N. With Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time.** By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 21s. [Vol. II. this month.]
- A MIRROR in AMERICA; or, Political Analogies Across the Atlantic.** By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. 8vo. [Ready.]
- ESSAYS on LITURGOLOGY and CHURCH HISTORY.** By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., of Sackville College. 8vo. [In the press.]
- CRISPIN KEN.** By the Author of "Miriam May." Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Bart., M.P. 2 vols. post 8vo.; Cheap Edition, 7s., with "A Word to Churchmen."
- The VALLEY of the MAUDE.** By the Author of "Atheline; or, the Castle by the Sea." [Ready.]
- The GOUTY PHILOSOPHER.** Edited by CHARLES MAC-KAY. [In the press.]
- The AMERICAN CHURCH and the AMERICAN UNION.** By HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- WHEAT and TARES.** Originally published in "Fraser's Magazine." Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- BETTER DAYS.** Edited by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." 2 vols. 21s.
- The DREAM of a LIFE.** By Lady SCOTT. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.
- The CURATE of CRANSTON.** By CUTHBERT BEDE, Author of "Mr. Verdant Green," &c. 10s. [Ready.]
- A WOMAN'S LIFE.** A Novel. 2 vols. 21s.
- LIFE AMONGST the COLLIERS.** 5s. [Ready.]
- LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND.** Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- The LITERARY WOMEN of ENGLAND.** 8vo. 18s.
- CHURCH RATE a NATIONAL TRUST.** By the Venerable Archdeacon DENISON. 8vo. 5s. New Edition.
- The LIFE of Dr. WOLFF.** New and cheap edition, revised and enlarged, with full-length portraits. 8vo. 12s.
- The CIRCUMNAVIGATION of the GLOBE by the Austrian Frigate Novara.** English Edition. Containing an unpublished letter from Baron Humboldt. With numerous wood engravings. Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Roderick Murchison. 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 30s. [Vol. II. Ready.]
- CONSTANCE MORDAUNT; or, Life in the Western Archipelago.** [Ready.]
- The STAR of LOVELL: a Tale of the Poor Clergy.** [Ready.]
- The FIELD of LIFE: or, Sowing and Reaping.** Second Edition. 31s. 6d.
- CLINTON MAYNYARD; or, The World, the Flesh, and the Devil.** 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- Why PAUL FERROLL KILLED his WIFE.** New and Cheap Edition. 5s.
- The LIFE and CORRESPONDENCE of LORD BACON: a Reply to Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Personal History of Bacon."** 8vo. 14s.
- REMARKS on ESSAYS and REVIEWS.** By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Madras. 11s. 6d.
- The CHARGE of the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON, 1862.** 4d.

PUBLISHED BY
Deighton, Bell & Co.
 CAMBRIDGE,
Agents to the University.

By E. HAROLD BROWNE, B.D., *Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.*

MESSIAH as FORETOLD and EXPECTED: A Course of Sermons on the Prophecies of the Messiah, as Interpreted by the Jews before the Coming of Christ. 8vo. 4s. [Ready.]

By WILLIAM WHEWELL, D.D., *Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.*

LECTURES on the HISTORY of MORAL PHILOSOPHY in ENGLAND. By W. WHEWELL, D.D., Master of Trinity College. New and Improved Edition, with Additional Lectures. Crown 8vo. 8s. [Ready.]

By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF ELY.

PARISH SERMONS. Fifth Series with a Preface on Sermons and Sermon Writing. 12mo. 7s. [Ready.]

First Series, Third Edition, 12mo. 6s.
 Second Series, Third Edition, 12mo. 6s.
 Third Series, Second Edition, 12mo. 7s.
 Fourth Series, 12mo. 7s.

A GUIDE to the PARISH CHURCH. Second Edition, 18mo. 3s. 6d. A Cheaper Edition, for distribution, price 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

On the IMITATION of CHRIST. A New Translation. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

A COMMENTARY on the GOSPEL of S. MATTHEW. Crown 8vo. 12s.

A COMMENTARY on the GOSPEL of S. MARK. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

By W. H. MILL, D.D., *late Regius Professor of Hebrew.*

OBSERVATIONS on the ATTEMPTED APPLICATION of PANTHEISTIC PRINCIPLES to the THEORY and HISTORIC CRITICISM of the GOSPELS. Second Edition, with the Author's latest Notes and Additions. Edited by B. WEBB, M.A. 8vo. 14s.

"It is the one book which we should urge our Divinity Students thoroughly to master, if they would be armed against the hydra-headed scepticism of our days."

Literary Churchman, December 9, 1861.

By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A.

A PLAIN INTRODUCTION to the CRITICISM of the NEW TESTAMENT. With numerous Facsimilies. For the use of Biblical Students. 8vo. 15s.

"... Though well aware, from Mr. Scrivener's invaluable contributions, of his peculiar ability for the task he has undertaken, we must say that it was not without some feelings of wonder that we examined the volume before us—so minute and accurate is the detailed information it conveys, and so comprehensive and enlarged is the view which it takes of the extensive field of Biblical criticism."—*English Churchman*.

By C. HARDWICK, B.D., *late Archdeacon of Ely.*

A HISTORY of the ARTICLES of RELIGION. To which is added a Series of Documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615. Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources. Second Edition, corrected and enlarged. 8vo. 12s.

A considerable amount of fresh matter has been incorporated, especially in the two chapters which relate to the construction and revision of our present code of Articles.

By A. C. BARRETT, M.A.

A COMPANION to the NEW TESTAMENT. Designed for the use of Theological Students and the Upper Forms in Schools. Fcap. 8vo. price 5s.

"A list of the passages of the New Testament explained or illustrated in its pages, concludes this valuable little volume, which will not only prove a great acquisition to Theological Students, but may, in the absence of larger works, be profitably consulted as a book of reference by all engaged in Biblical Studies."—*Literary Churchman*, Sept. 16, 1861.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCUM, Textus Stephanici, 1550. Accedunt variae lectiones editionum Bezae, Elzeviri, Lachmanni, Tischendorfii, et Tregellesii. Curante F. H. SCRIVENER, A.M. 4s. 6d.

An Edition on Writing Paper, for Notes, 4to. half-bound, 12s.

"One of the latest additions to the admirably-printed pocket series of Greek and Latin Texts. . . . Those portions of the text of which various readings are given at the foot of each page are printed in a thicker character of type, so as to be readily perceived."

English Churchman.

DEIGHTON, BELL, and CO., Cambridge.

London: BELL and DALDY.

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH'S COMPLETE WORKS.

1. WORDSWORTH'S POETICAL WORKS. In 6 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 30s. cloth.

2. WORDSWORTH'S POETICAL WORKS. In 1 Vol. 8vo. with Portrait and Vignette. 20s. cloth.

3. WORDSWORTH'S POETICAL WORKS. In 6 Pocket Vols. 21s. cloth.

* * * The above are the only COMPLETE Editions of Wordsworth's Poems.

Haydn's Dictionary of Dates. Tenth Edition. In 1 Vol. Demy 8vo. 18s. cloth; calf, 24s.

HAYDN'S DICTIONARY of DATES. Relating to all Ages and Nations; for Universal Reference; comprehending Remarkable Occurrences, Ancient and Modern; the Foundation, Laws, and Governments of Countries; their Progress in Civilization, Industry, Literature, Arts, and Science; their Achievements in Arms; their Civil, Military, and Religious Institutions, and particularly of the British Empire. By JOSEPH HAYDN. Tenth Edition, Revised, and greatly Enlarged by BENJAMIN VINCENT, Assistant-Secretary and Keeper of the Library of the Royal Institution of Great Britain.

London: EDWARD MOXON AND CO., 44, Dover Street.

By JOHN JACKSON, D.D. *Lord Bishop of Lincoln, this day, 1s.*

THE SINFULNESS of LITTLE SINS. Sins of Temper, Pride and Vanity, of the Thoughts, of the Tongue, of Omissions, &c. Cheap Edition for General Circulation. In elegant vellum cloth, Twelfth Edition, 1s.

"Well suited for distribution."—*Guardian*.

"Suited to all ages and classes, from the palace to the cottage."—*English Churchman*.

London: W. SKEFFINGTON, 163, Piccadilly, W.

FIFTY THOUSAND VOLUMES of RARE, CURIOUS, USEFUL, and VALUABLE BOOKS now on Sale at very greatly reduced prices, on account of Removal, by J. LILLY, 15, Bedford Street, Covent Garden, London.

A new Catalogue for June may be had on the receipt of two postage stamps.

Recently published, 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 15s. (original price, 1l. 8s.)

THE LIFE of DR. JOHN FISHER, Bishop of Rochester in the reign of Henry VIII., with an Appendix of Illustrative Documents and Papers, by Rev. JOHN LEWIS, M.A., now first printed from the original Manuscript, prepared by the Author for the press, with an Introduction by T. HUDSON TURNER, Esq.

London: JOSEPH LILLY, 15, Bedford Street, Covent Garden.

Price 2s. 6d.

Old English Ballads, &c.

FROM PERCY AND EVANS.

"The selection has been made with good taste and judgment."

Christian Remembrancer.

London: BELL AND DALDY.

New ready, 18mo. coloured wrapper, post free, 4d.

ON GOUT and RHEUMATISM. A

New Work, by Dr. LAVILLE, of the Faculty of Medicine, Paris; exhibiting a perfectly new, certain, and safe method of cure. Translated by an English Practitioner.

London: FRANCIS NEWBURY and Sons, 45, St. Paul's Churchyard.

Theological Books.

A CATALOGUE of Several THOUSAND VOLUMES of Second-hand THEOLOGICAL BOOKS, SERMONS, DISCOURSES, &c. may be had Gratis. Postage One Penny. THOMAS BAKER, 9, Goswell Street, London.

Now Ready, Price Sixpence, Part VII. of

THE QUIVER, containing the commencement of the new Tale entitled "MRS. HALLIBURTON'S TROUBLES," by the Author of "East Lynne," "The Channings," &c.

CASELL, PETTER, and GALPIN, Ludgate Hill, E.C.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co's.
Army, East India, & Colonial Agency,
 66, BROOK STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON.

(Near the East India House and the Oriental Club.)

MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & CO. beg to invite the attention of Regimental Messes, Officers, Members of the Civil Service, and other Residents in India, Australia, China, and the Colonies, to their Army, East India, and Colonial Agency, and to the advantages it offers.

Banking Department.

Pay, Pensions, Fund Allowances, Dividends, &c., drawn and remitted with regularity. *Sales of, and Investments in, Government Stock, Foreign Securities, &c.*, effected. Every other description of *Financial Business* transacted.

Supply Department.

Miscellaneous Supplies of every description, including Provisions, Wines, Plate, Jewellery, Books, Guns, Band Instruments, Clothing, &c., carefully selected and despatched by Overland Route, or Sailing Ship, to Regiments, and Messes in India and elsewhere.

Private Orders from Officers, Members of the Civil Service, and Residents in India, Australia, China, and the Colonies generally, are executed with care, economy, efficiency, and promptitude. *All Orders* should be accompanied by full and detailed directions.

Personal Agency Department.

The Constituents of MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. may depend upon receiving every attention to their requirements and instructions. Every assistance will be afforded to their Constituents and their families on their arrival in England, with the view to relieve them of every possible inconvenience. Charge, when required, will be taken of children when coming from India and the Colonies, and arrangements will be made for their education in England.

To those going out to India, Australia, China, and the Colonies, MESSRS SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. offer their Services to secure Passages Overland or by Ship, and to afford them all necessary information connected therewith. This department is entirely under the direction of a member of the firm long resident in India, who has an intimate knowledge of its language, and the wants and requirements of parties proceeding thither.

All Letters, Parcels, &c., will be received by MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. for their Constituents (whether in England, India, Australia, China, or the Colonies), to whom they will be forwarded regularly.

Terms.

No Commission charged on Regimental or Private Orders, and a Discount at all times allowed where a Remittance accompanies the ORDER.

GOODS, PACKAGES, PARCELS, &c., forwarded Overland or by Sailing Vessel to India, Australia, China, and all Parts of the World.

BAGGAGE, SHIPPED, CLEARED, and FORWARDED to its DESTINATION.

PASSAGES SECURED.

LETTERS AND PARCELS RECEIVED AND FORWARDED.

Pay and Pensions received for Officers and Civilians of H.M. Indian Service.

Ladies' and Gentlemen's Outfits procured. Supplies Purchased and Despatched, and Commissions of every Description Executed.

By Saunders, Otley, and Co., 66, Brook Street,
 Hanover Square.

THE LITERARY BUDGET,

THE ONLY MONTHLY LITERARY REVIEW.

Price one Shilling, Post free.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The *Literary Budget* (which has of late excited some small attention in the world) is conducted with considerable energy and skill.—*Literary Gazette*.

Amongst the monthlies we would notice the *Literary Budget*, a summary of news in literature, drama, science and art. It is very cleverly done.—*Guardian*.

The *Literary Budget* certainly has no small pretensions to merit. It is written with great spirit, the articles being moulded palpably on the model of those in the *Saturday Review*. The collection of news, gossip, and information is very extensive.—*Illustrated London News*.

The *Literary Budget* is conducted with great vigour, and we understand that writers of distinction contribute to its pages. Literature, the drama, science and art are impartially treated, and nothing can afford readers a better general idea of the progress of events. We should add that the printing is admirable.—*John Bull*.

The *Literary Budget* is a periodical which aims at being a kind of Monthly *Athenæum*. It seems exceedingly well done—the reviews and literary leaders being equal to the best kind of writing going. It deserves to succeed—and the public will be to blame if it does not.—*Press*.

The articles are ably written.—*Notes and Queries*.

Useful and well-executed, the *Literary Budget* more than fulfils its object of being a monthly *Athenæum*.—*Spectator*.

The *Literary Budget* is a successful attempt to supply a thoroughly independent record of literary matters. The reviews are ably written; the résumé of literary news which is given attests a thorough knowledge on the part of the writers of what is passing in the literary world, and the gossip which it gives is interesting and valuable. If it adopts the same tone of independence which pervades the first number, it is not hazarding much to predict for it a prosperous career.—*Observer*.

The *Literary Budget* is a monthly literary review of more than ordinary merit; the vigorous style adopted is a novelty, and it is pursued with great ability.—*News of the World*.

Although not, strictly speaking, a magazine, the *Literary Budget* is so useful a periodical, that it may be fairly included with "the monthlies." The object of the work is to furnish a complete review of English and foreign literature. For this end, a list is given of new works published during the month, together with capital notices of nearly all of them. Works of importance are honoured with long, well-written reviews, whilst minor ones are dismissed with a few pointed sentences. In addition, the *Literary Budget* contains all literary and artistic news, and some smart essays. For completeness, the periodical stands unrivalled.—*Shipping Gazette*.

The *Literary Budget* is one of the best monthlies, if it does not rank A 1. It is truly a marvel for the amount of matter it contains, the literary portion of the *Literary Budget* being the most extensive, complete, and admirable of all literary contemporaries; while the spirit and ability which characterize its reviews must render it invaluable to the man of letters, the author, or student. As a complete Digest of news for the month, in literature, art, science, music, and the drama, we honestly believe that the *Literary Budget* stands alone and foremost.—*Era*.

Considering the variety of the subjects brought forward, and the vigour and vivacity that pervade their tenour, we must congratulate this new Serial on its excellent arrangement, and on the superiority of its contents. If it is carried on with at all the same spirit and energy as marks its outset, there will be no cause to fear that it will have other than a favourable reception, or not fulfil its promise of being a *Literary Budget* on an extended scale and an elevated principle.—*Sun*.

The *Literary Budget* is decidedly the most racy budget of literature issued from the press.—*Liverpool Albion*.

No other publication supplies such a mass of literary news as the *Literary Budget*.—*Hastings News*.

The only known publication to which we can liken the *Literary Budget* is the *Saturday Review*.—*Wigan Standard*.

We will not depreciate other publications, but we would say to the most popular: "Look to your laurels, for the *Literary Budget* will prove a formidable rival." With critical acumen equal to the best of similar publications, the *Literary Budget* possesses a raciness all its own. If it has any fault it is that of young writers inclined to the too merciless use of the tomahawk and scalping knife. Still, however the unfortunate victims may feel, the public will enjoy the freshness and earnestness which have been sorely wanting of late years in the most literary publications.—*Jersey Independent*.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.

66, BROOK STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON.

And to be had of all Booksellers in Town and Country, and at all the Railway Book-stalls.

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY John & Charles Mozley.

BIOGRAPHIES of GOOD WOMEN. Chiefly by Contributors to the "Monthly Packet." Edited by the Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

SCRIPTURE LESSONS for the UNLEARNED. To be read with the Bible. By the Author of "Ploughing and Sowing." Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 9d.

SHORT PRAYERS for the HARD-WORKING, and for those who have but little Time to Pray. By the same Author. Demy 18mo. price 1d.

An ADDRESS to FARM SERVANTS who had been CONFIRMED, many of whom had soon after joined the PRIMITIVE METHODISTS or RANTERS. Demy 18mo. price 1d.

PLOUGHING and SOWING; or, Annals of an Evening School in a Yorkshire Village, and of Work that grew out of it.—From Letters and Private Notes. By a Clergyman's Daughter. Edited by the Rev. F. DIGBY LEGARD, late Scholar of University College, Oxford. Fourth Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, with frontispiece, price 3s. 6d.
"One of the greatest yet least obtrusive works for good that the Church of England has yet seen."—*Guardian*.

The MONTHLY PAPER of SUNDAY TEACHING. Under the same Editorship as "The Monthly Packet." Volume I.—Advent, 1860, to Trinity, 1861. Containing Readings for Sundays—Questions on the Gospels—Questions on the Catechism. Demy 8vo. (pp. 156), cloth limp, price 1s. 6d. Continued Monthly, price 1d.

The MONTHLY PACKET of EVENING READINGS. Volume XXII.—July to December 1861. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
Volumes I. to XII. price 3s. 6d. each. Volumes XIII. to XXI. price 5s. each. Continued Monthly, price 8d.

STORIES and MISCELLANEOUS READINGS for EVENING SCHOOLS. Prepared by the Author of "Stories and Catechisms on the Collects." In Monthly Numbers, fcap. 8vo. (pp. 16), price 1d. each. Nos. 1. to 7 are now Ready.
"Supplies a want much felt. It is an easy reading-book for adult learners, which secures the advantage of novelty and ready supply, by appearing once a month in Penny Numbers."—*Guardian*.

The MAGAZINE for the YOUNG for 1861. Demy 18mo., half-bound, price 2s. 6d. Continued Monthly, price 2d.

HERBERT'S HOLIDAYS: a Tale for Children. By the Author of "Dorothy," "De Cressy," &c. Demy 18mo. cloth, with Frontispiece, price 2s.

A FEW PLAIN RULES and HINTS for the FLORAL DECORATION of VILLAGE CHURCHES. Demy 18mo. with coloured Frontispiece and Woodcuts, price 6d.

A CONCORDANCE of the PRAYER-BOOK VERSION of the PSALMS. Demy 18mo. cloth, price 2s.

THE PSALTER; or Psalms of David. With the Canticles. Pointed for Chanting. By ROBERT JAMES, Organist of Ely Cathedral. Cloth, price 2s.; calf, 3s. 6d.; morocco, 5s.
The Canticles, with a Catechism on Chanting, price 2d. or 14s. per 100.

A HYMNAL, for use in the ENGLISH CHURCH. Fifth Edition, reduced in price. In cloth, 9d.; fine-paper edition, 1s. Cheap Edition, cloth limp, price 6d. A reduction to Clergymen, on taking numbers. The APPENDIX, done up separately, price 2d.

STORIES and CATECHISINGS in the Edition of the COLLECTS. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM JACKSON, Vicar of Heathfield, Sussex. 3 vols. fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 12s. 6d.

STORIES and LESSONS on the CATECHISM. By the same Author. 3 vols. fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 14s.

The SEASONS of the CHURCH, what they TEACH. A Series of Sermons for the Christian Year. Edited by the late Rev. HENRY NEWLAND, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Church, Devon. 3 vols. post 8vo. cloth, price 15s.

MEDIEVAL PREACHERS and MEDIEVAL PREACHING. A Series of Extracts, translated from the Sermons of the Middle Ages, chronologically arranged, with Notes and an Introduction by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead. Post 8vo. cloth, price 7s.

The HOLY COMMUNION: its Nature and Benefits. With an explanation of what is required of them who come to the Table of the Lord. By the Rev. W. H. RIDLEY, M.A., Rector of Hambleden, Bucks. Revised Edition, price 7d. cloth, or 24 copies for 12s. Fine Edition, imitation morocco, red edges, 1s. 6d.; calf limp, red edges, 2s. 6d.; morocco, gilt edges, 3s.

A PLAIN TRACT on CONFIRMATION, Explaining the Two Parts of that Holy Ordinance. By the same Author. Price 2d. or on superior paper with printed cover, 3d.

A PLAIN TRACT for those who have lately been CONFIRMED. By the same Author. Price 1d. or 7s. per 100.

The STOKESLEY SECRET. By the Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." Royal 18mo. cloth, with Frontispiece by J. B. price 3s. 6d.

CONVERSATIONS on the CATECHISMS, to the End of the Commandments. By the same Author. 2 vols. fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 7s. 6d.

SERMONS, preached in Village Churches. By WILLIAM JACKSON, M.A., Vicar of Heathfield, Sussex. Second Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, 5s.

SUNSHINE in SICKNESS. By the Author of "Pictures of the Heavens." Third Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, 2s.; calf limp, 3s. 6d.

PICTURES of the HEAVENS. Illustrated by Thirty-one Diagrams. By the same Author. Second Edition, fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 3s.

The WORD and the WORK; or, the Harmony of Scripture with Geological Discoveries. By ELIZABETH REDGRAVE. Demy 18mo. with Frontispiece, cloth, price 2s.

CHURCH POETRY; or, Christian Thoughts, in Old and Modern Verse. With numerous Woodcuts. Fourth Edition, demy 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.; morocco, 5s.

DAYS and SEASONS; or, Church Poetry for the Year. With numerous Woodcuts. Third Edition, demy 18mo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.; morocco, 5s.

London: JOHN and CHARLES MOZLEY, 6, Paternoster Row.

Books lately Published by MESSRS. RIVINGTON.

EIGHTEEN YEARS of a CLERICAL MEETING; being the Minutes of the Alcester Clerical Association, from 1842 to 1860; with a Preface on the Revival of Ruri-Decanal Chapters. Edited by RICHARD SEYMOUR, M.A., Rector of Kinwarton, and Rural Dean; and JOHN F. MACKARNESS, M.A., late Vicar of Tardebigge, in the Diocese of Worcester, now Rector of Honiton. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

"If these records have any merit, it is that they contain a history of clerical opinion during a not uneventful period, and a proof that the internal conflict of theological parties in the Church, often assumed to be more bitter than it really is, may easily be tempered by good sense and practical wisdom into friendly and not unprofitable discussion."—*Extract from Preface*.

THOUGHTS on PERSONAL RELIGION. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. In two Volumes, small 8vo. 10s. 6d.

ORDINATION LECTURES. Delivered in Risholme Palace Chapel, during Ember Weeks. By the REV. HENRY MACKENZIE, M.A., one of the Chaplains to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, &c. &c. Small 8vo. 3s.

CONTENTS:—Pastoral Government—Educational Work—Self-government in the Pastor—Missions and their Reflex Results—Dissent—Public Teaching—Sunday Schools—Doctrinal Controversy—Secular Aids.

The BEGINNING of the BOOK of GENESIS, with Notes and Reflections. By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D. Printed uniformly with Mr. Williams's Harmony and Commentary on the Gospels. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PRAISE, PRECEPT, and PRAYER; a Complete Manual of Family Worship. By JOHN M. CLABON. In one Volume, 8vo. (pp. 650.) 16s.

Part I.—Selections from the Old Testament, principally of Praise for Morning use.

Part II.—Selections from the Old and New Testaments, and from the best Commentators, for Evening Use.

Part III.—Selections from "The Imitation of Christ."

Part IV.—Prayers for Six Weeks.

THE MAN CHRIST JESUS; or, the Daily Life and Teaching of Our Lord, in Childhood and Manhood, on Earth. By the Rev. THOMAS MARKBY, M.A., sometime afternoon Preacher at St. James's, Paddington. In one Volume, crown 8vo. 9s. 6d.

NOTES on the EPISTLE to the HEBREWS, with Analysis and Brief Paraphrase. For Theological Students. By the Rev. E. H. KNOWLES, late Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. Dedicated, by Permission, to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. By the Rev. J. K. MILLER, late Vicar of Walkeringham, Notts, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.

RECENT RECOLLECTIONS of the ANGLO-AMERICAN CHURCH in the UNITED STATES. By an English Layman, five years resident in that Republic. In two Volumes. Post 8vo. 18s.

RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place, London.

Messrs. J. H. & J. Parker's RECENT PUBLICATIONS. OXFORD AND LONDON.

Now ready, Second Edition, with a Note by Professor OWEN.

The "REPLIES to ESSAYS and REVIEWS," by the Revs. Dr. GOULBURN, H. J. ROSE, Dr. HEURTLEY, Dr. IRONS, Dr. G. RORISON, A. W. HADDAN, and Dr. WORDSWORTH; with Preface by the LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, and Letters from the *Radcliffe Observer* and the Reader in Geology in the University of Oxford. 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

ADDRESS of the CANDIDATES for ORDINATION on the Questions in the Ordination Service. By SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and Lord High Almoner to Her Majesty the Queen. Third Edition, crown 8vo. price 6s. cloth.

DAILY STEPS towards HEAVEN; or Practical Thoughts on the Gospel History, and especially on the Life and Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, for every Day in the Year, according to the Christian Seasons. With Titles and Characters of Christ, and a Harmony of the Four Gospels. Twelfth Edition, in large type, square crown 8vo. price 5s. antique cloth. [Ready.]

The AUTHENTICITY and MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION of the PROPHECIES of ISAIAH VINDICATED in a Course of Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, M.A., Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library, and Select Preacher. 8vo. cloth, price 10s. 6d. [Just published.]

The MINOR PROPHETS. With a Commentary Explanatory and Practical, and Introductions to the several Books. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. 4to. sewed, price 5s. Part III. Amos vi. 6 to end—Obadiah—Jonah—Mich. i. 12. Part I. Hosea—Joel, Introduction. Part II. Joel, Introduction—Amos vi. 6.

The SUFFERINGS of the CLERGY during the GREAT REBELLION. By the Rev. JOHN WALKER, M.A., some time of Exeter College, Oxford, and Rector of St. Mary Major, Exeter. Epitomized by the Author of "The Annals of England." In fcap. [Nearly ready.]

IRISH HISTORY and IRISH CHARACTER. By GOLDWIN SMITH. Second Edition, post 8vo. cloth lettered, price 5s. [Just published.]

THREE LECTURES on MODERN HISTORY, delivered in Oxford, 1859-61. I. II. On the Study of History. III. On some Supposed Consequences of the Doctrine of Historical Progress. By GOLDWIN SMITH, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. In 8vo. cloth, price 4s.

A FEW NOTES from PAST LIFE: 1818-1832. Edited, from Correspondence, by the Rev. FRANCIS TRENCH, M.A., Rector of Islip, Oxon. Post 8vo. cloth gilt, 7s. 6d.

"These notes cannot fail to interest a far larger circle than the Editor's old associates at Harrow and Oriel."—*Gentleman's Magazine*.

"Mr. TRENCH has, we think, judged wisely in giving to the public what he tells us was first printed only for a few friends to read. There is no revelation of anything which delicacy would wish to veil, and he has been able, by publishing these letters, to give public schoolmen and Oxford men a picture of the past which they will glance at with pleasure."

Saturday Review.

An INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. By JOHN HENRY PARKER, F.S.A. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, with 170 Illustrations, and a Glossarial Index, fcap. 8vo. cloth lettered, price 5s.

An ATTEMPT to DISCRIMINATE the STYLES of ARCHITECTURE in ENGLAND, from the Conquest to the Reformation: with a Sketch of the Grecian and Roman Orders. By the late THOMAS RICKMAN, F.S.A. Sixth Edition, with considerable Additions, chiefly Historical, by JOHN HENRY PARKER, F.S.A., and numerous Illustrations by O. JEWITT. [Nearly ready.]

Some ACCOUNT of DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE in ENGLAND. With numerous Illustrations of Existing Remains from Original Drawings. From William I. to Henry VIII. By the late T. HUDSON TURNER, and J. H. PARKER, F.S.A. In 4 vols. 8vo. with 400 Engravings, and a General Index, price 3l. 12s.

"People do not realize the fact that Gothic ever was a prevalent civil style. Mr. PARKER's beautiful volumes on English Domestic Architecture come in most opportunely to drive away this error. His book opens to us a vast store of exquisite remains of mediæval civil architecture still existing in our country, and gives some glimpses of far richer stores which exist in other lands. The popular ignorance of this subject is truly amazing. Our land is still studded with beautiful fragments of mediæval domestic art; only the difficulty is to make people believe that they are domestic."—*The National Review*, January, 1860.

Oxford; and 377, Strand, London: J. H. and J. PARKER.

MESSRS. BLACKWOOD'S New Publications.

CAPTAIN CLUTTERBUCK'S CHAMPAGNE; a West Indian Reminiscence. Originally published in "Blackwood's Magazine." In 1 vol. post 8vo. price 12s.

The BOOK HUNTER, ETC. By JOHN HILL BURTON.

- I. HIS NATURE.—Introductory. A Vision of Mighty Book-Hunters. Reminiscences. Classification. The Prowler and the Auction-Hunter.
- II. HIS FUNCTIONS.—The Hobby. The Desultory Reader, or Bohemian of Literature. The Collector and the Scholar. The Gleaner and his Harvest. Pretenders. His Achievements in the Creation of Libraries. The Preservation of Literature. Librarians.
- III. HIS CLUB.—Clubs in General. The Structure of the Book-Clubs. The Roxburghe Club. Some Book-Club Men.
- IV. BOOK-CLUB LITERATURE.—Generalities. John Spalding. Robert Woodrow. The Early Northern Saints. Sermons in Stones. In crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE, in its ORIGIN, PROGRESS, and PERFECTION. By the Very Rev. E. B. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., Dean of the Diocese of Edinburgh. In Crown 8vo. price 9s.

POEMS and SONGS. By DAVID WINGATE. In fcap. 8vo. price 5s.

ESSAYS in HISTORY and ART. By R. H. PATTERSON. In 8vo. price 12s.

Colour in Nature and Art—Real and Ideal Beauty—Sculpture—Ethnology of Europe—Utopias—Our Indian Empire—The National Life of China—An Ideal Art-Congress—Battle of the Styles—Genius and Liberty—Youth and Summer—Records of the Past; Nineveh and Babylon—India; its Castes and Creeds—"Christopher North." In Memoriam.

A FAMILY TOUR ROUND the COASTS of SPAIN and PORTUGAL during the WINTER of 1860-61. By Lady DUNBAR, of Northfield. In post 8vo. price 5s.

GRAVENHURST; or, Thoughts on Good and Evil. By WILLIAM SMITH, Author of "Thorndale," &c. In crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

The DIVINE FOOTSTEPS in HUMAN HISTORY. Octavo, price 10s. 6d.

TWO LECTURES on the GENIUS of HANDEL and the DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER of his SACRED COMPOSITIONS. Delivered to the Members of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. By the Very Rev. Dean RAMSAY, Author of "Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character." In crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

The ODYSSEY of HOMER. Translated into English Verse in the Spenserian Stanza. By PHILIP STANHOPE WORSLEY, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College. Books I. to XII. In crown 8vo. price 9s.

LIVES of LORD CASTLEREAGH and SIR CHARLES STEWART, Second and Third Marquesses of Londonderry. From the Original Papers of the Family and other sources, embracing a full Account of the Campaigns of 1813 and 1814 in Germany and 1815 at the Congresses of Vienna, Laybach, and Verona. By Sir ARCHIBALD ALIS, &c., &c., Author of "The History of Europe." In 3 vols. 8vo. price 2l. 2s.

New General Atlas.

Dedicated by Special Permission to Her Majesty.

The ROYAL ATLAS of MODERN GEOGRAPHY. In a Series of entirely Original and Authentic Maps. By A. KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.S.E., F.R.G.S., Author of "The Physical Atlas," &c. With a Complete Index of easy reference to each Map, comprising nearly 150,000 Places contained in this Atlas. Imperial folio, half-bound in Russia or Morocco, 5l. 15s. 6d.

The NOVELS of SIR E. BULWER LYTTON, BART. A Library Edition. In fcap. 8vo. 5s. each Volume.

Already Published:—The Caxtons, 2 vols.—My Novel, 4 vols.—What will he do with it? 4 vols.—Devereux, 2 vols.—The Last Days of Pompeii, 2 vols.—Rienzi, 2 vols.—Leila and Calderon, 1 vol.—The Last of the Barons, 2 vols.—Harold, 2 vols.—Pilgrims of the Rhine, 1 vol.—Eugene Aram, 2 vols.—Zanoni, 2 vols.—Pelham, 2 vols.—The Disowned, 2 vols.

TOM CRINGLE'S LOG. A New Edition. With Illustrations by Stanfield, Weir, Skelton, Walker, &c., engraved by Whympers. Crown octavo, price 6s.

The PAST and PRESENT LIFE of the GLOBE: Being a Sketch in Outline of the World's Life-System. By DAVID PAGE, F.G.S., Author of "Text-Books of Geology," &c. With Fifty Illustrations, Drawn and Engraved expressly for this Work. In crown 8vo. 6s.

HISTORY of the GREEK REVOLUTION. By GEORGE FINLAY, LL.D., Athens, Author of "The History of Greece under Foreign Domination." 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

ADAM BEDE. By GEORGE ELIOT. A Cheap Edition. Complete in 1 vol. price 6s.

The MONKS of the WEST. From St. Benedict to St. Bernard. By the COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT. Authorized Translation. 2 vols. 8vo. price 21s.

NORMAN SINCLAIR. By W. EDMONSTOUNE AYTOUN, D.C.L., Author of "Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers," &c. &c. 3 vols. post 8vo. 31s. 6d.

EGYPT, the SOUDAN, and CENTRAL AFRICA: With Explorations from Khartoum on the White Nile to the Regions of the Equator. By JOHN PETHERICK, F.R.G.S., Her Britannic Majesty's Consul for the Soudan. In 8vo. with a Map, 16s.

45, GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH; AND
37, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON.

PRO ECCLESIA DEI.

Church and State Review.

No. 2, Vol. I.

July 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

Earl Russell.



WHIGGISM in politics and Nonconformity in religion are natural allies. The nature of the things is the same: the subject-matter is not different, except so far as a part is different from the whole. In one aspect the religious life includes the political life: in another, the political life includes the religious life. There is no proper severance between Whiggism and Nonconformity. Their root is the same; their inevitably downward tendencies are the same: their final issue is the same. It follows that if Whiggism be wrong, Nonconformity is wrong; and if Nonconformity be wrong, Whiggism is wrong. Now we have undertaken not to say ill-natured things of Nonconformists or of Whigs; and we hope to keep our pledge in letter and in spirit. But we have not undertaken, and do not mean to undertake, not to tell the truth about Whiggism and Nonconformity. For we have a creed, religious and political; and it is our business to set it out to the best advantage, both by way of exposition and of contrast.

The connection and resemblance between Whiggism and Nonconformity is on the surface: the instances are historical. Both Whiggism and Nonconformity have their root in a principle which is a fault of our nature, and a primary fault. They are the particular political and religious development of that principle in England, where there has always been a special bond between them, over and above their general affinity, arising out of their common relation to the national life in Church and State. For political hostility to English institutions, in its successive phases of depreciation and assault, has, from the first, sprung out of and found its chief nourishment and support in religious dissent. The principle of which we speak is the rejection of all authority external to themselves, coupled with the stringent and unsparing exercise of their own. This is the root and the application both of Whiggism and of Nonconformity. We are not saying at all that the rejection has not been provoked. Tyranny and priestcraft have much to answer for. But we are dealing with the things as they are in their proper nature, not as they may admit of palliation or excuse; and it may reason-

ably beget a suspicion that there is something wrong in the inner nature of Whiggism and of Nonconformity to see that the "civil and religious liberty," which is their common watchword, is no part of the practice of either one or the other. No politician is so exclusive and domineering as a Whig: no religionist so intolerant as a Nonconformist.

But these are only outside and surface indications of a great fact. Let us look a little deeper. Now it is true that, however natural the alliance between Whiggism and Nonconformity, they are not at all times, and cannot be, the best of friends. There are disturbing causes. It is not always convenient for the one to give what the other wants; and so there is, not uncommonly, a mutual suspicion and a bitterness of denunciation in these natural allies which is certainly not exceeded in the most avowed enemies. In one thing, however, they agree in council and in act. They are not for Church and State. They are against Church and State. They make it their joint business to pare away and circumscribe the position of the National Church, till it shall be only one of many sects or denominations: the Whig says—with the accident of connection with the State—because it does not suit the Whig to give this up. The Nonconformist says—without any such accident at all. This is one of those little discrepancies which serve, better even than exact agreement, to show how close and intimate is the alliance between the two.

Well, says the Whig, here is a pretty piece of thanklessness. Is this the way the Church of England is advised to treat her best friends? Was it not Whiggism that came to the rescue in 1688, and as then, so ever since, has it not steadily maintained the National Church alike against Roman Catholicism and Nonconformity? Now all this may have been plausible enough to urge and to predict, and people might be excused for believing it all a century and a-half ago, shallow though it were; but it is a little too much now. There is no fact in English history better ascertained, and few so well, as that it was not the Whigs—much less the Nonconformists—but the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England who brought about the Revolution of 1688. But we waive this point, and we ask, what did Whiggism take under its protection in 1688? What has Whiggism taken under its protection ever since, till, in its naturally downward course, it has come to clamour for the inclusion of the specific things

C

which in 1688 it most laboured to exclude? It was not the Church of England at all, *qua* the Church of England, that Whiggism patronized so warmly in 1688. It was the right of private judgment. Whiggism patronized the Church in 1688 not at all because the Church, being primitive and apostolic, had, in its appreciation, rightful authority in controversies of faith, but because it was at that time, in Whiggism's view of the matter, the chief and most powerful representative and exponent of the right of private judgment as against the Church of Rome. Now Whiggism was right to oppose the Church of Rome, and it might be wished that it did not play into its hands so much now; but it was not right to pretend that, because it did so, it cared for the Church of England except in a political and parliamentary sense. What it cared for then, and has cared for ever since, is a very different thing indeed. What Whiggism meant then by the right of private judgment—as it means by it now—was very plain at the time to all thoughtful minds; and it has been so well and clearly illustrated since by all the history of this particular development of the man political, that it has become plain to most minds without much thinking about it. Whiggism meant, and means, by the right of private judgment—as Nonconformity does—the right of every man to choose and to make his own religion for himself: a thing which has no existence in the world because of man's nature, and the circumstances of man's nature, birth, education, position; and which, if it were possible, which it is not, as none show that they understand better than the Nonconformists themselves, proceeds upon an assumption fatal to all religion—that all religions are of equal value. Whiggism being in truth a very superficial thing, and having no proper soundness about it, has, from the first, confused between the right of private judgment and the duty of private judgment.

There is then an inherent viciousness and unhealthfulness lying at the root of Whiggism, just as there is of Nonconformity. From Nonconformity Whiggism cannot separate itself, however it may from time to time feel the union to be very unpleasant—as it does just now—and injurious to the respectability it is so anxious to maintain. But the exigencies of the case are too much for Whiggism with all its grand traditions, and fine names, and great families. There never was in any history a creature so pretentious as a Whig, or one who, from his friendships and alliances, lives in more continual dread of exposure. He has never been more than half in earnest, if indeed so much: but his friends and allies are quite in earnest, and care little or nothing about many things which it is no part of Whig policy, if it can help it, either to abandon or to compromise. There are a good many Whigs, for example, who have all along voted for abolition of Church-rate just because they know it can never become law. Now this is dangerous ground and damaging to the Whig. It is not in our time as it was a hundred years ago. Government in England, Whig or Tory, was a different thing then. Now, your Whig is obliged to say a great many things, and to do some things which look very like revolution to keep his Non-

conformist friends from breaking up the confederacy, and setting to work to destroy Church and State on their own account. It would not at all suit the Whig politically to break up Church and State, but he is getting every day deeper into the mud.

It is the inherent viciousness of Whiggism—a viciousness which has made it ever since it was born to be in a perpetual flux, causing decline and portending death—which is the true account of a good many startling things in the historical character of Whig statesmen. Of Whig statesmen Earl Russell is the present type. Lord Palmerston does not come into competition. He is no Whig certainly; and whether he be reducible under any political category we do not know. Now what is the historical character of Earl Russell? Here is a son of a great Whig house—a man of illustrious name, good private repute, and great parliamentary and official experience: of respectable abilities; no great genius; not very learned or literary; no diplomatist, and no orator; but, notwithstanding these little matters, chief among the Whigs, *Primus inter pares*.

Earl Russell has no political character left. He has played ducks-and-drakes with it to such an almost incredible extent that it is irrecoverably dissipated and gone; and the author of a very able and powerfully written book just published, called, *The Present Position of the "Liberal" Party*, merging "Whig," as he has a fair right to do, in the wider term "Liberal," as it is popularly employed, finds in Lord Russell's reckless political career the principal cause of the present hopeless condition of the "Liberals."

It is our belief that what is here assigned as a cause is more properly an effect. No doubt political profligacy in a leader of a party damages the party not a little. The man and the party act and react. But no amount of political profligacy in a leader of Liberalism can sufficiently account for the wide and prevailing ruin of "Liberal" hopes. We conceive the truth of the case to be rather what we have indicated above. Whiggism is inherently vicious, and carries within it that which poisons its own life. Earl Russell was born in a Whig palace, cradled in a Whig cradle, fed with Whig pap out of a Whig spoon. Of the training of his boyhood we do not know much, except that it was of course pure Whig. In his youth he had small chance of imbibing sound principles; specially had he small chance of arriving at a knowledge, with which, to hear him talk, you would think he was very conversant, but which he is, in truth, absolutely without, the knowledge of what is meant by "the Church." Thus, filled up to the throat with Whiggery, and with nothing else, he came early into Parliament. The name and the necessities of the party have done the rest.

Now a man cannot be the slave and the tool of a vicious principle and not suffer harm and loss in his own nature. In this case Whiggism has been too much for the moral instincts of an otherwise respectable man, whose whole being from first to last has been made over to the purposes of its praise and propagation. The decline and fall of

Whiggism is not then so much Earl Russell's work, though he has certainly lent it a helping hand, as its own work. In its fall it has dragged down with it the great Whig of our time. But the fall would have come without Lord Russell. It is only the natural issue of the birth and progress of the thing fallen. Here again Whiggism is on all-fours with Nonconformity, which always carries within it the principle of its own decay and death. No Nonconformist sect has ever remained long as it has begun. Its grounds of separation from the Church are scarcely asserted when they become confused and indistinct, and mixed up with those of other sects; and it is pretty much the case with sect after sect now that they have nothing very peculiar and distinguishing about them. They have a common hostility to the National Church, which was in the world before them, and will be in the world when they are all gone; and that is all. Much in the same way Whiggism, which began with something like a creed, has ended in having none which, for any practical purpose, can be distinguished from the general licence of what is called "Liberalism," but which is really nothing else than the spirit of revolution. In so far as Whigs of the present day are consistent, and mean what they say, they are Radicals. There is nothing left of Whiggism but the name.

What has happened to Whiggism and the Whigs should serve as a warning to many who are not Whigs, but who coquet with Whiggism or "Liberalism" a great deal more than is either decent or safe. You cannot touch pitch and not be defiled. In the same proportion as Conservatism is inoculated with Whiggism it is an organized hypocrisy. Here again we may observe a counterpart in those members of the Church of England who play with Nonconformity till it turns round and bites them, as in the present silly business of the proposed "Bicentenary" commemoration.

There are, we conceive, three classes of men who, for one reason or another, do about all the real injury that is ever done to Church and State, being all of them its very good friends.

First, there is the class who, regarding it only in its political aspect, make merchandise of it without scruple for party purposes. Of this class Earl Russell is the type. Here is a statesman who tells you that if you allow a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, you cannot refuse him leave to marry any one of his relations he may desire; and then votes for the Bill to please the "Liberals." Here is a statesman who tells you that he is quite unable to understand how there can be an Established Church without Church-rate, and then votes for abolition *pure et simple* to bring back the Whigs.

Another class is represented by Mr. Gladstone. These are men who, being in such sort the slaves of their intellect that even their conscience is powerless in its grasp, go about to contrive how they may, by some tortuous process, delude the "Liberals" into the notion that they are serving their interests at the Church's expense, but take care so to adjust the service that it has no result for the "Liberals," though in the process infinite damage be done to Church and State. A memorable instance of this may be seen in what was called Uni-

versity Reform. The old religious and distinctive character of Oxford University has been broken up and destroyed, for the purpose, as it was said, of opening a way into it to the Nonconformist body. The injury has been done. Oxford has no distinctively religious character remaining. But it is scarcely possible to suppose that it was not foreseen and intended by the promoters of the "Reform" that it should be done for nothing.

The third class is that of men who do not appear to possess enough intellectual power to discriminate between a detail and a principle, and unconsciously betray the last, supposing it to be the first. Of this class Mr. Estcourt is the type.

All the types have this in common. They are men of high private character, and they all say that they mean well to Church and State. It is just this good private repute which, with their perpetual professions, aggravates the mischief of their political licence, or their intellectual subtleties, or their incapacity. If a ship hoists the black flag you know what you have to expect, and you prepare yourself as well as you can. But if it bear down upon you under your own national colours, and then sweep your decks from stem to stern, it is no fair fight; and your defeat or capture is aggravated by the consciousness that you have been taken in, and that you ought to have known better.

The National Society.



HERE is every year, about this time, what is called the general meeting of the National Society. It is a thing *sui generis*, a curiosity, this general meeting of a body which is taken to be the authoritative exponent of the action of the Church of England in respect of the school teaching of the poor. In all years it might be expected to gather about it a good deal of interest; and this year, what with re-re-revised code, and resolutions and debates had in Parliament, and other resolutions and debates to be had next year in Parliament, and the crowding together of people in London, it is not surprising that a plain man, a friend of ours from the country, and a member of the Society, should have looked to the meeting with some interest and some anxiety as to a great and important gathering of Churchmen, Clergy and Laity; and should have expected that some definite principles of action, past and to come, would be submitted for general approval by the meeting. He judged the general meeting of the National Society by what he knew of the general meetings of other bodies; and having taken care to be in good time to secure a seat, found himself, at 3 p. m., on Thursday, June 5, upon a bench in the smaller room, in King Street, St. James's, with a good many feet to spare on either side. At first he did not know quite what to make of the aspect of the room, but as the meeting went on his surprise ceased. He found that there was no business. To receive a report is always dry work; but to receive a report upon the bringing up of which no amendment may be moved, and to listen to some three or four very discursive and desultory speeches in sup-

port of one or two empty and complimentary resolutions, is neither business nor amusement. He soon perceived that he might have laid out his afternoon more profitably and more agreeably.

Now what is the key to all this? There are two keys. First, it has always been with the utmost difficulty that these meetings have been made to have anything of reality or of a business-like character about them. Those of us who were in any degree behind the scenes from 1847 to 1852, when the Management Clause battle was, not as Mr. Hubbard seemed to say at the meeting, fought and won, but fought and lost, by the National Society, will know very well what we mean. This year an attempt at something real was renewed from last year by Mr. Mayow. It was the only thing approaching to business, and accordingly was resisted by the Secretary on the ground of insufficient notice; although public attention had been called to the subject-matter of Mr. Mayow's amendment, and specially the attention of every member of the Committee, by the Archdeacon of Taunton, in the autumn of 1860, and Mr. Mayow had brought it under the notice of the general meeting of 1861. However, the resistance answered its purpose for one more year; and when every man upon the platform, except the Archbishop of York and the Secretary, had disappeared, and more than half the scanty number present in the body of the room had retired before the wearying unrealities of the afternoon, Mr. Mayow got a hearing, and made an excellent and unanswerable speech in moving an amendment to the second resolution. But it would have been absurd and useless under such circumstances to press the amendment to a division; the mover, therefore, contented himself with giving notice that, unless the Committee revise and amend the matter in complaint, he will be ready with his amendment, or substantive resolution, as it may be arranged, at the general meeting of 1863, when possibly the members of the Society may have arrived at some knowledge of what is at stake, and may take the trouble to attend.

It is in connection with Mr. Mayow's amendment that we are compelled to indicate key No. 2. The Committee of the National Society claim for themselves the exclusive management of the Society's interests; but *the Committee of the National Society do not run true*. There are grievances then, grievances of the conscience of members: but there is no redress. Not only is there no redress, but there are no facilities given, but the reverse, for open discussion. The general meetings are thus not only an absurdity, but a wrong; and so long as these things are so, men who have things to do in life think very justly that they are better away.

The particular grievance to which Mr. Mayow addresses himself may be stated in a few words:—There is a certain Memorandum of the Committee, bearing date July 23, 1860, out of which has arisen a state of things not only wholly new and strange, but such as the imagination of the good men who founded the Society in 1811, "for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church," could by no means have conceived to be possible.

In that Memorandum it is laid down, that, to pro-

vide in the Trust Deed of a school "that every child shall be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy, is incompatible with Union."* Now it is true that the National Society have in past years so expressed and interpreted the first term of Union,† as not to exclude from Union those founders who think that children may be admitted into a Church school without being necessarily taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy; and we have no desire to call this interpretation in question. But who ever heard till now—at least till July 23, 1860—that those who do not think so, and who therefore provide schools for such children only as shall be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy, are doing what is "incompatible with Union?" The Committee of the National Society have surrendered here the liberty of founders to constitute schools, which shall be exclusively Church schools without forfeiting on that account a share in the Parliamentary Grant. The Committee of the National Society have done more than surrender that liberty. They have denied its existence. They declare that it "is incompatible with Union." They have done more still: they have, in their Memorandum of July 23, 1860, used the liberty of managers as an argument against the liberty of founders. That they do so surrender and deny the liberty of founders is plain on the face of the Memorandum itself, where the reason is assigned why such constitution of a school "is incompatible with Union." What becomes then of the position of all those founders of Church schools who hold that a Church school must be exclusively a Church school? What is their liberty? When they apply for a share in the Parliamentary Grant, the Committee of Council are able to quote against them the declaration of the Committee of the National Society, that the proposed constitution of the school "is incompatible with Union."

No one can be surprised that the Committee of Council should not have been slow to avail themselves of the above declaration on the part of the Committee of the National Society.‡ But what suits very well the Committee of Council does not necessarily suit the Church. It does not suit the Church to be told that to found a school with a clause in the Trust Deed to the effect that the school shall be open to such children only as shall be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy, "is incompatible with Union" with "the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church." Nor indeed can such a declaration be made to consist with the first term of Union itself, as this has been modified; for the whole extent to which such modification goes, or can be pressed by any mental process, is to include the wider interpretation of the first term of Union; not to exclude the stricter, that is to say, the natural, interpretation.

What we have come to then is this; and it is one of the most curious instances of "decline and

* See Monthly Paper for September, 1860, p. 257.

† The first term of Union now stands thus, "The children are to be instructed in the Holy Scriptures, and in the Liturgy and Catechism of the Established Church."

‡ See Mr. Lingen's Letter to the Rev. H. A. Olivier, published in the *Guardian* of September 19, 1860. See also a subsequent Letter from the Committee of Council, dated September 27, and published in the *Guardian* of October 10.

fall" upon record. Here is a "Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church." The Committee insist upon a right to administer the resources of the Society subject only to their informing the general body of what they do after they have done it. Now one of the things they have done is this:—They have, since July 23, 1860, cast out of the pale of the Society every founder whose conscience does not allow him to provide for the admission into his school of any children other than such as are to be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy of the Church of England. All such founders they have put under a ban. No such constitution of a school, they say, is compatible with Union. If members of the Society are not cognizant of an act so monstrous on the part of the Committee, it is high time they should be. If they are cognizant of it, and permit it to stand, more shame to them.

It would be amusing, if it were not distressing, to find the Committee of the Society, at the same time that they do this, blaming the Committee of Council for imposing "conscience clauses." It is in this as in all other like cases; if Churchmen will eat up their principles, not for the sake of nourishment, but to get rid of them, it is no wonder if the food turns to poison. It is impossible to invent a more comprehensive, a more unprincipled, and therefore a more damaging, "conscience clause," than that which is embodied in the Memorandum of July 23, 1860.

The Ballot.

N Wednesday, July 2, Mr. Berkeley is to move the second reading of his Bill for taking of votes at Parliamentary Elections by Ballot. If in some respects a new journal has its advantages in coming fresh as it were to the consideration of many a hackneyed though not uninteresting subject, it occasionally finds them fully counterbalanced by the duty which its recency of origin imposes on it, of discussing proposals which those who have been longer in the field now pass over in contemptuous silence. Foremost among such subjects every argument in its favour having been alike refuted by the *a priori* reasoning of common sense, and by the light of practical experience, is the Ballot. If anything was wanted to sink this once vaunted and indispensable point of the people's charter to a lower depth than that in which it was previously buried, it was fully supplied by the circumstances of its temporary triumph in May last. It will be in the recollection of our readers that, a hurried division, within five minutes of the time when its champion rose to advocate it, produced a majority for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the future taking of votes by Ballot; anticipating Lord Palmerston, who was hurrying to his place to speak against the motion, and against time. Lest any one should fancy that this majority, however gained, is a sign that this question is making way, it is to be noted that fourteen years ago it had a similar apparently good fortune, obtaining a majority of five in a House of 170. Now nothing

that has ever happened with respect to the question has more thoroughly shown its inherent weakness. Not to speak of the notorious fact that, even of the few who voted for it, a large portion only did so because they knew it would never be carried; the very proposer of a measure, which by his own admission would make a vital change in the Constitution, did not on this occasion attempt to bring forward a single argument in its favour; and so little did he expect the sanction of the House even for a moment, that, when he had thus obtained leave to bring in a Bill, &c. he had no Bill at all ready to bring in. And he has now, in consequence, fixed to move its second reading on a day when, even should he again obtain a majority, there would be no longer time to get the Bill through the House of Lords. Whether it be respectful to Mr. Berkeley's brethren of the House of Commons to mock them with measures no more intended to go off than a child's gun in a toy-shop, may be a question; but it is not one on which we are called to pronounce an opinion. Nor need we do more than briefly refer to the arguments by which every man with the slightest pretence to a knowledge of human, and especially of English nature, or to a candid impartial judgment, not to speak of a statesmanlike capacity, has long been convinced that the Ballot, if carried according to the scheme of its original proposers, would have been utterly ineffective to achieve the concealment which was its object. And that that concealment, if practicable, would have been vicious and unconstitutional in principle, and mischievous in operation. The measure would be ineffective to achieve concealment, because it would be to no purpose for a man to conceal the vote which he gave on a particular day, unless throughout his whole life he concealed his opinions on every matter which ought to interest him as a free citizen of a mighty empire; such an universal and persevering reticence involving a capacity for systematic falsehood and hypocrisy, which is certainly foreign to the British, and we hope to the human disposition. Such concealment again, were it practicable, would be vicious and mischievous, because, as the possession of a vote is a political privilege, and the giving of a vote is the discharge of a political function, it is wholly at variance with the theory and practice of our Constitution to allow such privileges to be exercised, and such acts to be performed in the dark.

But if every measure for taking votes by ballot is open to these fatal objections, Mr. Berkeley's present Bill is more liable to them than any other that has yet been brought forward. He no longer proposes to compel all votes to be thus taken, but merely to give any one who may wish to conceal his sentiments a right to deliver his vote in secret. Can even the most favourable construer of the actions and motives of others believe that Mr. Berkeley is serious in thinking that a single voter in the whole kingdom will avail himself of this permission? That one single man will be found so abject, so base, and at the same time so hardy and shameless, as to be at once afraid to express his political opinions, and to avow in an assembly of bolder and honester men that he is so afraid? That one individual with a single drop of British blood in his veins will be

found to come forward and say, "Those around me are open, straightforward, and independent men: they avow their principles; they stand by their friends: I, and I alone in this wealthy borough, in this great country, dare do neither, and I am also so fixed in habits of falsehood, so inured to every subterfuge of hypocrisy, that, as for the last seven years no one has been able to guess at my sentiments, so for the next seven no word or look of mine shall ever betray the vote I am about to give." It is generally a bold act to assert an universal negative, but here the universal instinct of the nation makes it safe to do so: we affirm that such a man does not exist. Could such a thing be, the whole scope and object of our legislation would be fundamentally changed. All the labours of our legislators of former ages would prove to have been utterly thrown away. The whole aim of all those great men, to whose accumulated wisdom we owe all our blessings as a people, has been to make us free; and not only free in our persons, but (what is still more valuable and essential) in our thoughts and our tongues. If among the blessings which the tender nurse prays for her child this is among the chiefest, that *fari possit quæ sentiat*, our legislators have at all times been equally impressed with its absolute necessity for the welfare of the people at large. And can we suppose that one Englishman will be so base as, in the face of day, to renounce for himself a blessing which his forefathers have with such labour and care secured for the whole nation, and have prized all the more because no other people under the sun shares it with them. It was finely said by a former member for Bristol, nearly a century ago, that "an Englishman was the most unfit person on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery." But what Burke believed to be beyond his powers, Mr. Berkeley undertakes, and, even going beyond that achievement (after all the additional light that has been thrown upon every point connected with measures called democratic by the histories of France and America) he proposes now to induce Englishmen to argue themselves into slavery; to renounce their freedom of thought, their independence of language, hitherto the proudest articles of their birthright, and to enslave their minds and tongues for the rest of their lives to escape from what they feel neither as an evil nor as a danger, but which designing or weakminded theory-mongers persuade them that they ought to look upon as both.

In one portion of the kingdom alone is it credible that men might be found to claim what its advocates call the protection of the ballot; not even there of their own choice, but in obedience to dictates which they have unhappily no power to disobey. Should Mr. Berkeley's Bill pass, it is possible that the Roman Catholic voters in Ireland might be driven by their priests to seek such concealment; the object of those who would compel them to do so being not that the vote given might be concealed from every one, but that it might be hidden from the landlord, while the confessional would reveal it to themselves. It is hardly necessary to point out how greatly such a state of things would increase the power of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, already far too great if we regard the mischievous manner in which too many of them exercise it over

the poorer members of their flocks. If there were really any prospect of such a measure as this of Mr. Berkeley's passing, the additional weapon which it would thus place in the hands of a priesthood so prone to abuse its sacred authority would be an element of danger worthy of the gravest consideration. As the case stands it is sufficient merely to indicate it.

The character of the measure thus proposed being such as it is, the Prime Minister can hardly escape severe condemnation for allowing it to be treated in his cabinet as an open question. It is too much Lord Palmerston's way to treat important principles slightly, where he does not foresee immediate practical and personal inconvenience from so doing. He himself has never scrupled, whether by ridicule or by grave argument, to expose the fallacies of the ballot-mongers, the impracticability and mischievous tendency of the ballot. But though this might be sufficient for an independent member, the country expects, and has a right to expect, more from a Prime Minister. However absurd, visionary, or impracticable a proposal may be, yet if it goes to violate the principles of the constitution, to change and deteriorate the character of the people, it is not unimportant. That the adoption of the Ballot would have this effect Lord Palmerston believes as firmly as any one; and while he does believe this, it is certainly his duty not to palter with it, but to discountenance it with the whole weight of his authority, to oppose it with the unanimous vote of an undivided Government.

The Whigs and the Church of England.



THE Whig party in this country has, ever since the Revolution of 1688, arrogated to itself the title of the "Constitutional Party." We are not going, on the present occasion, to discuss the justice of their claims, which may or may not be well founded according to the particular view we take of the theory of the English Constitution. But one thing is quite clear, that the National Church of England is one of the elements of that Constitution; and that whichever of the two parties be really the true depository of constitutional traditions, it is under as strict obligations to maintain the rights, liberties, and property of the Church of England as it is of Parliament and the Crown.

On the other hand, we have of course this truth to deal with, that the English constitution is not supposed to be stereotyped for all time. It has required at different times to be stretched in one direction, contracted in another, and pruned in a third. These periodical re-adjustments will be few in number in proportion to the wisdom bestowed upon them. But no one will dispute the broad fact, that as the balance of power has to be preserved in Europe by occasional re-distribution of territory, so the balance of power among the different forces of the constitution has to be maintained in England by occasional re-distribution of authority. We say thus much in order to anticipate the obvious

retort by which our opening remarks might be encountered. The Whigs may be the constitutional party, but circumstances may have occurred to render necessary a reconsideration of the rank which the Church holds in the constitution. Because the Whigs do not support the Church, it might be argued, it does not follow that they do not support the Constitution. This is plainly far too wide a question to enter upon in these columns. What we do wish to point out is this, that boldly to take up the position here indicated is the only way of justifying the behaviour of the Whigs in Parliament during the last thirty years. To have either tacitly connived at, or openly supported, propositions of which the manifest tendency, to say nothing of the avowed design, is the separation of Church and State, is painfully dishonest conduct on the part of any body of men who still contend that Church and State ought not to be separated. It is impossible to evade this conclusion. It is not a question about which there can be two opinions, as there may be about the reduction of the franchise or the extent of the prerogative. No one even affects to doubt that the anti-Church agitation which has been recently sustained in the House of Commons under Mr. Bouverie, Mr. Baines, and Sir John Trevelyan must terminate, if successful, in the dissolution of the union between Church and State. Yet this agitation has the support of Whig speeches and Whig votes.

If the Whigs had come forward honestly and declared of the Church, as they declared thirty years ago of Parliament, that her position in the country required a complete reform, they would have been, however much opposed to our own views, honourable, consistent, and not improbably victorious. Now, however, they have lost the confidence of both parties. The Radical Church reformers will long remember their late speeches. The Tory Church defenders will long remember their late votes. The one will see that they cannot trust them in prosperity, and the other that they cannot trust them in adversity. No doubt it is better for the Church of England that the Whigs have acted as they have done, than that they should have really united with the Dissenters. But how much better than either would it have been if that considerable body of English gentlemen who still represent the old Whigs had had the courage to act on their convictions, and so prevent the hope of fundamental changes from taking root in the minds of Nonconformists.

Such conduct, unhappily, is what every party is liable to which is unable to stand by itself and on the inherent strength of its own principles. The Whigs had long ago exhausted the vitality of the old Whig creed, which meant the redress of abuses combined with the preservation of the Constitution. Everything which a pure Whig considered to be an abuse had been destroyed by 1833; and henceforward the whole existence of the party has depended on the success with which they could simulate a reforming spirit, when it was really dead within them. This desperate position has driven them to patronise revolutionary measures against their own most cherished convictions; has forced them anew into the arena of Parliamentary Reform with sickly en-

thusiasm and aching hearts, and has left them no resource but submission when summoned to make war upon the Church.

We beg to call the attention of our Conservative friends to this aspect of the question. If the Conservative party had the whole of that motley aggregate which calls itself the Liberal party honestly opposed to them on Church questions, there might indeed be some plausible pretext in favour of concession and compromise; but when they know that this is not the case, when they know that they have only to stand firm, and that the ranks of their opponents *must* melt away by degrees for want of that real sympathy which can alone hold men together for any length of time, it seems infatuation under these circumstances for the Church's friends to cede one inch. We may depend upon it that the Whig-Radical alliance has, as far as the Church is concerned, done its worst. The tide has turned, and but a little more patience and firmness is required on the part of the Conservatives to relegate Clergy Relief Bills, Religious Worship Bills, and Nonconformist Burial Bills to the limbo of forgotten absurdities, there to rest peacefully alongside "the Rights of Man," "the Wrongs of Ireland," and "the Five Points of the Charter."

Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.

If, however, for the sake of speculation, we go a little deeper than the above remarks which affect exclusively the posture of affairs at the present moment, we shall be interested in observing the tenacity of political associations. We think it is quite possible that though any quiet Whig old gentleman, when not baited by a Radical, or otherwise exercised in his mind, may be practically just as fond of his church, his parson, and his prayer-book as any other man, yet in the inmost recesses of his brain there does lurk a vague idea that these are his natural antagonists. His party was linked with them for a short time, as the Dissenters were, in opposition to absolute monarchy; but when the temporary necessity had passed away the rank and file of each relapsed into their old attitude. Addison's Tory foxhunter congratulated himself that there was not a presbyterian in the county except the bishop. And the bishop was of course a Whig. The Whigs kept the Church quiet during the first half of the eighteenth century by their unscrupulous exercise of patronage, but they felt instinctively that they had no friends beyond the Bench. Thus dislike of a "priest" came to be a kind of fashionable sentiment with the Whig aristocracy; and, in one form or another, it has been handed down to the present day. We see it strong in Lord Macaulay; we see it strong in Sydney Smith; we see it strong even now in the *Edinburgh Review*. Through these various influential channels the idea has been sedulously propagated that a priest is either an ignorant and sensual bigot, "fat with the crackling of tithe pig;" or a dark, dangerous, and narrow-minded intriguer. Macaulay's picture of the clergy of the seventeenth century is not only in itself unjust, but is purposely drawn in the most coarse and insulting language. The chaplain at the Great House "might fill himself full with the corned beef and carrots, but he was expected to retire, &c.;"

the curate thought himself lucky if asked to share the servants' Sunday dinner; and during the rest of the week he loaded dung-carts for the farmers. Sydney Smith was never tired of pointing his sarcasms against Church dignitaries, who were all, to trust him, sunk in sloth, self-indulgence, and indifference. This general idea of the clergy is what the Church owes to the Whigs. But it is in perfect harmony with the most ancient Whig traditions: so that although the separation of Church and State is very far from being a Whig theory, yet an habitual depreciation of the clergy has become so intertwined with Whiggism, that our old gentleman aforesaid is unable entirely to forget it, and no doubt often finds himself in a state of curious distraction between the force of personal sympathy and that of traditional prejudice. We are willing to admit, therefore, that underneath and behind the influence of party exigencies, which drives him into the arms of quakers, jumpers, and ranters, there may, in the breast of many a good old Whig, be still found a substratum of anti-clerical feeling—the sediment of bygone folly, which deemed it fine to be a free-thinker. In the place where the buff waistcoat ought to be he may still at times become conscious of a feeble pulsation against "priestcraft," testifying to his true descent from Sidney, Shaftesbury, and Wharton; as sometimes through an old man thrill momentary beats of youthful passion. The curse of his origin is upon him. The poison yet works in his veins. Like Holmes's *Elsie Venner*, he struggles painfully with a mysterious instinct. He is drawn by an uncontrollable impulse away from what he really loves towards the haunts of the ancient serpent which are situated below the gangway. Doubtless, with age he is gradually wearing out the taint. When tranquil, as we have already said, he is almost unconscious of its influence, and delights, as others do, in the solemnity and majesty of a church. But he is not yet wholly dispossessed. And while the necessities of his position are calculated to aid the expiring efforts of the old sentiment, he probably never will be.

For it is a necessity of which we speak. The Whig knows well enough that if he is not to surrender that cherished name, and amalgamate those time-honoured colours with those of his hated rivals, he must keep up the show of an assault upon some institution or another. It is the tenure of his political existence. Lord Palmerston is not a Whig, nor is he the slave of Whig traditions. But he is absolutely indifferent, and on such subjects as these is at the mercy of men who *are* Whigs. We ought to be thankful that these are fast diminishing, as their presence on the political battle-field tends to obscure the true issue, and to mislead us as to friends and foes. But enough yet remain to be exceedingly mischievous in their way; and to cause the agitation against the Church to be protracted for some time longer.

With these two influences at work to override their better feelings, it is not to be expected that the Whigs should not support the Radicals. Parliamentary weakness, and hereditary vice, nearly worn out though it be, conspire against that respect for the English Church in which few landholders

are deficient. As long as their parliamentary position can be secured by a support which produces no result, no doubt the better pleased they will be; for we believe that their liking for the Church is in itself stronger than any other feeling. But if the Conservatives do not at once take such steps as may demonstrate the futility of further agitation on the subject, there is no saying what pressure may be placed upon the Whigs, or how much trouble they may yet cause to the champions of the Church of England.

Mr. Estcourt.



HERE are a good many members of both Houses whose position upon the Church-rate question it is not easy to understand, and who probably have no clear understanding of it themselves. But there is no one of them to compete with Mr. Estcourt.

Mr. Estcourt some two years ago was a great advocate for self-exemption; and it was upon his evidence ~~more than~~ upon anything else that the conclusions of the Lords' report, in 1860, were founded, giving power to every man, Churchman or Dissenter, who did not like to pay Church-rate, to exempt themselves from such payment without further ado. In a country which professes to respect rights and vested interests, and to be governed by equal laws, this is about one of the most curious legislative propositions on record.

This year Mr. Estcourt, in moving his amendment to the second reading of Sir John Trelawny's Bill, threw self-exemption overboard. Just as he relied upon it before to cure everything, so now he would have nothing to say to it at any price.

It was a wise act—rather it would have been a wise act if it had been complete. But Mr. Estcourt deceived himself. Self-exemption was not struck out of his list, as he supposed it to be: it had only retired a minute from the stage to put on another dress. In a few days Mr. Estcourt gave notice of a resolution, or string of resolutions, the burden of which is to get rid of Church-rate as it is, and to make it voluntary. So much as this was plain upon the face of the resolutions. For the rest no man could clearly understand what they meant and what they did not mean; and it now appears that Mr. Estcourt did not understand this himself, because he has materially altered them. Having employed ourselves all the time we could conveniently give, and to the best of our poor abilities, we have no clear perception of what the meaning and extent of the altered resolutions may be. Then, again, having, we suppose, had it pointed out to him that the order of the resolutions was dangerous, Mr. Estcourt changes the order.

Now all this is very amiable and very like the man: but the question is whether it be statesmanlike, or fair or respectful to the Church and to Parliament to propose for adoption from day to day in a matter of the utmost gravity—*quicquid in buccam venerit*. It might have been thought that changes and vacillations in policy such as Mr. Estcourt has exhibited would have been accompanied with some

measure of distrust of grasp of the subject and of power to deal with it. But there is no symptom of any such distrust. Mr. Estcourt goes to his work just as if he had always been of one mind about it, and was doing it on a principle. But what one expects to see every morning in the daily papers is some change of purpose. Perhaps it may be that this sort of mind is not capable of self-distrust.

Further, it has come to be generally allowed that if Church-rate is to be legislated about at all, it can only be upon the responsibility of the Queen's Government. Accordingly, Mr. Estcourt, a distinguished member certainly, but a private member, of Parliament, produces his own plan, with about as many editions of it as Mr. Lowe's Code, and about as intelligible and satisfactory. But the principal thing remains. Mr. Estcourt does not appear to see that the resolutions he proposed on Tuesday last are not only inconsistent with, but are contradictory to, the resolution which he carried against Sir J. Trelawny, May 11. In *that* resolution the House of Commons, following Mr. Estcourt, declared it to be unjust and inexpedient to abolish Church-rate without provision made by Parliament to enable churchwardens to meet the liabilities incident to that office. No man could read the resolution and say that any one of the liabilities attaching to that office was excepted. If Mr. Estcourt meant to except any, *he should have said so*. In *these* resolutions Mr. Estcourt asks the House of Commons to sweep away half the liabilities—all those of the worship—and, under new conditions, to provide for an occasional fabric and yard rate only. This is, to say the least of it, a very curious way of doing business. Mr. Estcourt, unconsciously to himself, has done a thing which, in most men, would be considered dishonest. *Nemo fuit unquam sic impar sibi*.

So it is that good men go blundering on because they do not grasp principles: alienating friends: helping none but enemies: harassing the Church: digging pitfalls for simple and half-informed men. And, in these days of "the manhood of the world," "advanced intellect" and little knowledge, the number of half-informed men is alarmingly on the increase. Every man has his opinion, not always very lasting, but very strong so long as it lasts, because every man can read a newspaper; and some men must have their resolutions and their bills upon the gravest matters of Church and State. But few men look beyond their noses, and, if a man has a long nose, not so far.

Mr. Estcourt has withdrawn his resolutions. It was foreseen, from the first, that they could have no other issue. But the House of Commons gains nothing by being turned—to use Sir George Grey's expression—into a social science gathering. For our part, we say what we have said before, but which, like the other remark repeated above, will bear repeating, that there is no middle course between abolishing Church-rate and maintaining it in its entirety. There are many reasons why no compromise can be had; but one will suffice, as it did for the French disputant,—*Monsieur, il y a sept raisons; d'abord c'est impossible*.

Clergy Relief and Burial Bills.

HORACE'S rule about making money—*si possis rectè, si non, quocunque modo*—has been largely applied this year to legislation in the House of Commons. Somehow or other, in the dearth of good and useful things, other things, neither good nor useful, must be made law. It cannot be said of the House, as is said somewhere of a man in one of Hood's stories, "he had nothing to do and he did it:" it would be better if it could. This appetite for meddling and mischief has left deep traces, whatever may in the end become of the several attempts, in such examples of statesmanship and reverence as "Clergy Relief" and "Burial" bills, Church-rate bills and resolutions. These things are incident to Church and State, and it is better they should come than be suppressed: because it is mainly by the discussion they receive in Parliament that their real character is brought to the knowledge of the people at large; and, as the principles which they all, more or less, invade happen to be true, the more discussion, the more safety. But the process is painful from many causes, private and public.

The Clergy Relief Bill may probably pass the House of Commons. There we hope it will stop. No attempt at legislation at once more futile and more injurious will, at any time, have been put upon record. It is futile because there will hardly be a man found in a century to avail himself of its provisions. It is injurious because it suggests many things that are wrong, and disparages many things that are right. A Bill of one clause, getting rid of the civil pains and penalties attaching to a clergyman "relieving" himself of his orders, would have met with no objection and with much approval. But this is not the character of Mr. Bouverie's Bill, even as it has come from the Select Committee and has been received favourably by the House. It is strange that the House of Commons, Churchmen and Nonconformists alike, should have yet to learn that it is not by depreciating and lowering the status of the Church of England that they will do their part in guarding against the unhealthy and dangerous influences of the Church of Rome.

There are four principal reasons why the Burial Bill should not become law, and no reason why it should. If the clergy and the churchwardens, whose special concern it is in the first instance, are indolent about opposing it, and it should become law, they may blame Parliament, if it relieves their minds to do so, but much more justly would they blame themselves.

The first reason is, because what is proposed to be done by the Bill is wholly unnecessary and uncalled for, there being no grievance to be redressed, except such as is included in the great standing grievance of a National Church; and, even supposing there were a grievance independent of this general and comprehensive grievance, the particular grievance alleged is so infinitesimal and exceptional

that it is not only absurd, but it is contrary to all just principles of legislation to legislate about it at all. If, indeed, toleration of Nonconformity means equality in all respects with the National Church, then by all means let the Bill and other bills like it, as many as you please, be brought in and made law with all convenient dispatch: but if toleration in its largest sense does not mean equality, then let no such bill as this find any favour with Parliament. All the parade made in the Bill about giving a permissive power to the incumbent is only so much dust thrown in to blind simple people's eyes to what is really attempted to be done under the provisions of this Bill.

The second reason is, that the Bill is an invasion of the trusteeship of every incumbent of a parish, and of every churchwarden in respect of the parish churchyard. It would not be possible under the Bill for either incumbent or churchwarden to ensure public order and decency. Ancient rights entrusted to the keeping of the clergy and churchwardens of the Church, established by law for the general good, ought not to be interfered with, except in a clearly-ascertained case of a paramount public necessity.

Thirdly, this Bill would not only give opportunities for, but will stimulate, scenes of excitement and scandal in parish churchyards shocking to the feelings of all religiously-minded people, whether Churchmen or Dissenters.

Fourthly, it is a step, and a very decided step, towards the entertainment and ultimate concession of a like claim on the part of Nonconformity to the joint use of the parish churches.

It is easy to understand that the last of the four reasons here enumerated, being the principal reason against the Bill, is just that which, in the eyes of its promoters, is most in its favour. We do not doubt, indeed, that it is in this view that the Bill has been conceived; and that the alleged grievance about burial is only a pretext to be laid aside, as occasion serves, when it has done its work. But, as it is easy to understand this, it is, on the other hand, very hard to understand that any man, who cares for the Church of England and its national existence, can deceive himself into thinking that he has anything to do with such a Bill but to reject it. We say again here what we have said before, but which will bear repeating, that no man can do at once two opposite things, maintain a building, and pull out its foundations. But, nevertheless, this is the exact account of the parliamentary action of a great many members of both Houses, from whom the Church of England has a right to expect better things. There is one advantage growing out of all this mischief. At the next election we mean to know a little more about our men—about, that is, the men we are going to have. Many an elector who has never canvassed will canvass then—many an elector who has concerned himself hitherto very little about his vote, will then take any amount of trouble to prevent his Conservative member, who has voted for, or has not voted against, such Bills as these, from finding himself in his old place in a new Parliament. As for the Whigs, it has long been with them that it is only by their promises at the hustings to join with political Dissenters and Roman Catholics to

damage the Church of England that they get returned at all.

Meantime it cannot be concealed that, if the Bill pass the House of Commons, the improvement in the parliamentary position of the National Church, which is comforting so many hearts, will have disappeared. It will have been proved that it was only an accident, and not a property, of the House of Commons that it had, of late years, shown, in some other cases, a disposition to distinguish between the true and the false meaning of toleration and of civil and religious liberty; and some Churchmen who were thinking, perhaps, that happier times were come, in which they might safely confide the welfare of the Church to their representatives without the necessity of continual watch and ward, will have the ungrateful conviction forced upon them that they have been too sanguine; and that *the* work is yet to be done which can issue in any security of the kind.

Mexico.



THE name of Mexico stinks in the nostrils of Englishmen. They know that the country is inhabited by a people who profess to fulfil a sacred duty in not paying their debts, and whose chosen amusements are to cut each other's throats, to shoot the strangers who develop the resources of the land, and to invent, every six months, some new form of anarchy, which is dignified with the name of government, and which is always the result of "an effort to establish the rule of reason and morality." Very sensibly, therefore, it has been determined by common consent to be as ignorant as possible of everything connected with such a race, and the feeling of momentary interest which was compelled by our intervention in its affairs gave way to one of blank relief when the disagreement with France cleared us of all further responsibility. The check, however, which General Lorencez has received before Puebla again changes the aspect of things. We shall, therefore, however little we may like it, be obliged to think and to read about what will certainly become, if it be not already, a first-rate political question.

Ever since the fall of Santa Anna, whose government was the last tolerably strong one that Mexico has seen, the Reactionists and the Liberals have been, almost without interruption, at open war with one another. Both have succeeded at different times in raising a temporary preponderance; neither have at any time secured the acquiescence of the nation as a whole; and latterly, at any rate, it would be difficult to say whether the Governments formed by the one or the other have rested on more unsound foundations. In 1860 a legally constituted Government repudiated the accepted constitution of the Republic at its seat in the city of Mexico itself, while the constitution was upheld by another Government, irregularly constituted, at Vera Cruz. Both were equally lawless in their acts. If that which harassed the interior robbed and murdered with a freer hand, it was only because

the upland towns were less exposed to the guns of English and French men-of-war than those upon the coast, and the authorized burglary at the house of the British Minister was almost balanced in enormity by the stoppage of the Laguna Seca Conducta. So soon, indeed, as the Liberal party found themselves in safety at the capital they became as indifferent to assassinations, and as palpably dishonest in money matters as their predecessors had been before. No doubt this state of matters was very unpleasant. England has heavy claims against Mexico, which a respectable people would satisfy at once; but the Mexicans are not respectable, and there was no hope that any motive short of a very urgent fear would induce them to pay the arrears of interest on the loans, to restore the money stolen from the Minister's house, and from the Conducta, and to "compensate" the families of Englishmen who had been killed. The temptation to intervene was very strong, and the clamour from the residents very loud; but before yielding to either temptation or clamour, it was the duty of the Government to consider whether it could intervene effectually, and, if so, whether an intervention would put England into a better or worse position on the whole.

Apparently they had come to a negative conclusion, for insults and injuries enough to justify a dozen interventions were patiently submitted to; and apparently it has recurred to this belief, since it has grasped with ill-concealed joy the excuse for withdrawal which was presented by the development of the intentions of the French; but it was carried away by passion or gained over by blandishment for a long enough time to make this country appear very ridiculous, and to put it into a very false position. It was not consistent with our dignity to contribute so small a portion of the forces to be employed that we should have been eclipsed by a second-rate power, had the joint expedition been continued; and as the objects which we proposed to attain did not justify the despatch of an army, we ought simply to have refrained altogether from moving. We should have been positively humiliated if a march into the interior had been found necessary to secure the legitimate ends for which the treaty was concluded between England and France and Spain. The nation, however, is so glad to have escaped from the possible consequences of the ministerial blunder that it is only too ready to condone the errors which have been committed; and it must in frankness be allowed that Lord Russell has behaved with considerable tact from the moment that he began to retrace his steps. It is now better worth while to consider what will be the effects of the unsupported and uncontrolled intervention of France. If Mexico is to be regenerated at all it is impossible to deny that French assistance is the means which offers the best hope of success. It is idle to expect that either of the two parties which have so long contended for power in that country will be able to keep so permanent a mastery over the other, as to attract the wealthy and respectable classes to its support by establishing an abiding *régime* of order and lawfulness. On the other hand, of the two nations, the interference of which would be the least resented, there can be no

doubt that France is the one which holds out the more solid guarantees to the world and to the country itself. The interest of the United States is to encourage the exspoliation of the provinces which it is part of the liberal programme to effect to a certain extent. The policy of France is to support the Church, and, in compassing its own ends, it strengthens a faction which happens to be identified with the principle of centralisation. Federal and Centralist would in truth be better names than Liberal and Reactionist for the parties which are at present represented to the eyes of Europe by Juarez and Almonte; and if these names were given to them there would be more chance that Mexican politics would be seen to possess definite colour, and our own interests would be better understood than is at present the case. With the exception that the Liberals confiscate the property of the Church, and that the Reactionists ignore the confiscation, there is little other difference of aim between the two parties than that the former maintain and would enlarge the rights of the several provinces, while the latter would gather all authority into the hands of the Government at Mexico. Obviously everything which adds to the importance of the provincial Governors works to the detriment of the central power and to the disintegration of the State; the Northern Americans have, therefore, persistently upheld the Liberal party. Their only object is to prepare the country for absorption; and whether they intrigue to substitute one government for another, or whether they offer, in an embarrassed state of their own finances, to assume a further liability to assist the Mexicans, they act directly towards this end. Whatever, therefore, might be the ultimate beneficial effect of American interference in Mexico, however noble and however refined might be the civilization which would be in time imposed upon the degenerate inhabitants, the immediate results can only be greater confusion and more thorough retrogression. Of course it may be said that a French conquest also implies confusion and retrogression; but it does not imply them to the same degree. The commencement of American conquest must be postponed, that of French invasion is present: and there is so much greater affinity between the French and the Mexicans than between the latter and the Yankees, or even the Southerners, that the crisis would be shorter and less violent. The inability of the Anglo-Saxons to assimilate other races does not seem to be diminished by the change which their nature has undergone in America, as is witnessed by the existence side by side with them there of the French and Irish and German populations: a conquest, therefore, of Mexico from the North would probably mean displacement of the Indian and Spanish elements. The French, on the contrary, have no intention of holding the country permanently, and, even if circumstances compelled them to do so, could mix easily with a cognate race, which is already prepared for their reception by the knowledge which it possesses of their civilization. Although the commerce of Mexico is chiefly with England, it is the language of France which is studied, it is French literature which is read, and through a French medium are received whatever ideas respecting Europe have

penetrated thither. At this moment, moreover, the respectable portion of the people would probably welcome with delight any force of any form of government sufficiently strong to impose order, and their sympathies are as probably in favour of one which would secure unity to the nation whether in a state of independence or of temporary dependence. It is not a sufficient argument against this to point to the resistance which has been organized, and to the stationary attitude to which the French are momentarily reduced. The turbulent classes, who would lose by the cessation of anarchy, and the Liberal party, who would be hurled from power, might be expected to struggle for a while; and a defeated faction, and classes who have never taken part in political life, cannot be expected to stir until they see that the expedition has been entered upon seriously, and with forces which will command success, nor until they feel sure that they will not be left to the revenge of their enemies. There need be little fear that when the French have made good their ground they will not be supported by the bulk of the population; the more serious question is the situation in which they will find themselves with regard to America. Yet it is improbable in the extreme that the necessary antagonism or even hostility of the United States has not been foreseen, and it is at least possible that it has been a motive for the expedition. The opportunity for disagreement, and so for interference in the domestic quarrel of the North, the facilities for trade, and for the conveyance of assistance, through Texas, may not be among the least of the inducements which have spurred the Emperor to action. Whether this be so or not, the presence of the French in Mexico must soon bear upon the greater difficulty of the North, and it will be strange if it does not become an important element in the complication of which we now see but the beginning.

Earl Canning.

EARL CANNING'S life was such as those who knew him well from his boyhood were prepared to anticipate. Everything in his intellectual composition was eminently sound; and his temperament and turn of mind were calculated to bring to early maturity a judgment naturally exact, and perceptions unusually clear. As a boy at Eton he showed talents, which, though considerable, were not of that sort which seem to have characterized his father. There was vigour and solidity of intellect, but no marked originality. His perception of humour was keen, and his appreciation and enjoyment of polished wit showed a fineness of mind and a play of fancy which seemed ever ready to sparkle forth in language, but to have been checked partly by natural reserve, partly by fastidiousness of taste. This habit of mind, which showed itself early, remained unchanged through life. At Oxford, as a student of Christ Church, he read steadily, but also took an active part in the ordinary amusements of the place: he was rather inclined to select friendships than to general society.

On taking his degree he gained the highest honours in mathematics, and the second highest in classics; thereby evincing that intellectual tendency to accurate reasoning rather than to literary versatility which his friends knew to be the natural leaning of his mind.

An intellect of this cast and a temperament of a somewhat kindred character, coupled with a sensitive fastidiousness of taste, do not prompt their owner to aim at oratorical fame. It was reserved for Earl Canning to add to the honours of a great name by great qualities of a different though of a less glittering order.

The public are in possession of the facts of Earl Canning's career as Governor General of India: and whatever opinion may be entertained, either by the present age or by posterity, of the correctness of some of the details of his policy, all men of all parties seem agreed that in the greatest crisis that ever befell our Indian empire Earl Canning proved himself to be possessed of the cardinal virtues—justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude—in a degree which, though it did not surprise his friends, was the admiration and delight of those who shared his anxieties and perils, and caused it to be said, by one of the greatest of those great Englishmen who aided him in saving our Indian empire, "Lord Canning seems to be almost the only man out here who has a calm head upon his shoulders." But no calmness of temperament or fortitude of soul could stay the workings of ceaseless toil on a constitution not naturally strong: and to ceaseless toil was added at last the bitterest domestic sorrow.

Earl Canning came home to die. England has lost a statesman of noble nature, admirable judgment, vast experience, and matured wisdom. His friends have lost a man whose memory they could scarcely bear to dwell upon were it not for the assured hope that ere long they shall be permitted to see him again.

Our Want of Clergy.

SURVEY of the relation of the Clergy to the laity, as regards numbers and intellectual culture, at different epochs and in different countries, would be a curious study. In both respects it has varied, and still varies, very greatly. While apostles yet lived, and "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble," were enrolled among the baptized, there is no reason to suppose that there was any lack of teachers, or that they were in anywise inferior in natural gifts to the average of the flock. Yet even then the seventy who were sent forth by the Divine Head of the Church probably included the accomplished and highly-educated physician S. Luke; and when the intellect of Athens was to be informed of the truth of that unknown God whom it ignorantly worshipped, the task was committed to one, who (in addition to the loftiest supernatural graces and revelations) combined in his own person the rank and *status* of a free-born Roman citizen with some knowledge of the philosophy and literature of Greece, and a training in all Jewish lore at the feet of Gamaliel. And as outward manifestations of a miraculous nature became less frequent, the more abundantly did Divine wisdom win for the service of the sanctuary the learning, the genius, and the eloquence of the age. The very errors of here-

tics, it has been truly said, transformed simple believers into doctors. Persecutions by heathens and Arians brought out the powers of government possessed by great rulers of the Church; insomuch that even Gibbon remarks of S. Athanasius, that he "displayed a superiority of character and abilities, which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy." The qualities displayed by the Primate of Egypt were again and again manifested, on a less extensive scale, by bishops in Germany and in France during the Middle Ages: and happily the time has now gone by in which it was necessary to plead for these statesmen-bishops against the charges of ambition or undue intermeddling with concerns that did not belong to them. Readers of the works of M. Guizot or Sir Francis Palgrave and other like-minded historians must be well aware that secular offices of trust were in those ages imposed upon ecclesiastics, simply because there was no one else fit to undertake them. For a defence of the position of the mediæval Clergy, in brief space, we would refer the reader to an article on *Michelet's History of France* in the *Edinburgh Review* (we think it was the number for January, 1845), or to its reprint in the collected essays of its author Mr. John Stuart Mill. Possibly the case on behalf of the Church, as contrasted with the State, may be over-stated in that article; yet, strange as it is to look for enlightenment in such a quarter, we must avow that Mr. Mill's view of the mediæval Church seems to us more fair, more philosophic and profound, than that of the Dean of Chichester, which has not long since been so ably criticised in the columns of the *Guardian*. In those ages the meaning of the terms *beau-clerc*, *clerkly skill*, *legit ut clericus*, indicate a great deal. They show where learning resided, and, as a consequence, authority and influence.

But prosperity may be too great. In many countries the Church became more rich and powerful than was at all conducive to its best and highest welfare. Take Scotland, for example, where at least one-third (some say one-half) of the land had become the property of the Church. There is indeed no nobler specimen of the statesman-ecclesiastic than that of Archbishop Kennedy of St. Andrews, in the first half of the fifteenth century, under James III. But in the far different character of Cardinal Beaton, we recognize the dangerous declension to which such positions render the ecclesiastical profession but too liable.

Then came the tremendous, the deeply-needed, shock of the Reformation. What is the language of the latest work that discusses this topic from a Roman Catholic point of view? "In the beginning of the sixteenth century," writes Dr. Dollinger, "there was spread far and wide in Germany a strong repugnance against the Poppedom as it was then; and no unrightful indignation with reference to abuses in the Church, and the moral depravity of a much too numerous and far too wealthy clergy."*

The immense benefit which accrued to the Roman clergy, the improvement of their character resulting from the Reformation, has been alluded to by even Presbyterian historians like Dr. Robertson. And unquestionably the struggle won to the study of theology on both sides some of the most commanding intellects of the day. What was the stature of such a man as Loyola may be partly gathered from the writings even of Sir James Stephen and of the Nonconformist Mr. Isaac Taylor. What the powers of Martin Luther, may be imagined from the description of the Roman Catholic theologian just cited. Dr. Dollinger terms Luther "the mightiest democrat and most popular character that Germany has ever possessed—the greatest of his age—the centre of a new circle of ideas, the most condensed expression of that religious and ethical mode of thought peculiar to the German mind, and from whose mighty influence even those who resisted it could not wholly withdraw themselves."†

We pass *per saltum* to the latter half of the eighteenth century. On both sides, in continental Europe, zeal has

waxed fainter. Lutherans and Calvinists have lost their first warmth. The Roman Catholic prince-bishops of the empire are fast sinking again into mere secular lords. The different branches of the house of Bourbon have entered into a family compact to crush the Jesuits, in a manner that calls forth the sternest reprobation from the pen of the Ultra-Protestant historian Sismondi. In England such minds as those of Hooker, Andrewes, Pearson, intellectually among the first of their time, have almost ceased to be found among the clergy. The numbers of the priesthood are not enlarged to keep pace with the increase of the population: there is no sufficient sub-division of parishes; the social *status* of the Clergy is in some parts of the country much too low, and is, perhaps, tending downwards everywhere.

Another mighty shock is impending. It is not unfrequently asserted that the French clergy must have been sunk in sloth and depravity before the outburst of the great Revolution of 1789. Such is probably the impression which would be left by the work of Mr. Carlyle; and his somewhat servile follower, Mr. Dickens, likewise intimates it in his powerful *Tale of Two Cities*. But such a view will not, we believe, bear the slightest examination. Mr. Carlyle, in his *French Revolution*, deliberately omits all notice of the terrible massacre at the Carmes. The tale of the heroism there displayed might interfere with the lessons which it is his desire to inculcate. Doubtless there were among the higher clergy some execrably bad specimens of their order, such as the Cardinal de Rohan of diamond-necklace celebrity; nor is it probable that the average of the *curés* was what it had been even in the earlier part of the century. The fairest view of the French clergy before the overthrow of the Gallican Establishment is probably that given by Count Louis de Carné in his *Etudes sur le Gouvernement Représentatif en France*. Without thinking badly of their personal character, M. de Carné (though an earnest Roman Catholic) condemns with just severity their applause of Louis XIV. in his persecutions of the Huguenots; their endurance without a murmur of the consecration of the infamous Dubois as successor to Fenelon; their silence during the wickednesses of the reign of Louis XV; their lack of charity and wisdom, and *above all, their allowing the sacred lamp of knowledge—one of the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit—to pass into the hands of their enemies*.

But our business is with ourselves. We have dwelt thus long upon the faults of others, partly by way of warning, partly by way of encouragement. Noble as was the manner in which Bishop Horsley, and even the Baptist Robert Hall, spoke and acted with reference to the suffering French clergy, it is highly probable that the spectacle of such an overthrow was calculated to do good to our own Clergy. The war, which increased the value of land, seems to have raised the social position of rural pastors in England, and the Evangelical movement, though deficient in anything like scientific theology, did great things in respect of earnestness and devotion to the proper work of the Clergy. Then arose a spirit of profounder thought and deeper study, and in nothing was the so-called Tractarian movement more successful than in the manner in which it persuaded men of the most varied gifts and temperaments to give up the secular professions they were about to enter, and take upon them the service of Christ's ministry. Here was a young aspirant for the bar, whose ingenuity and eloquence might have achieved much forensic success; there an Anglo-Indian with his lucrative appointments; and in another place one whose fortune and position seemed to mark him out for a county-member. All alike were resigning their worldly prospects and seeking the cure of souls. The years between 1830 and 1845 mark a brilliant period of Anglican Ordinations.

But there went away from us—let us frankly look it in the face—some of the most powerful among those who had led, or shared, in this wonderful uprising. Those whose yearning for abstract authority was more ardent than their love for primitive antiquity departed from the Church of England; distrust followed, fainter hopes, less ardent zeal.

* *The Church and the Churches*, (Eng. Trans.) p. 26.

† *Ibid*, pp. 26 and 267.

The Broad-church movement has not supplied the void—we find it hard to believe that it can have won us recruits for the priesthood either many in number or great in value. Let us briefly consider what we have at present to deplore; its causes and its possible remedies.

Firstly, then, we are wanting in numbers. Of course, as we have seen, it is possible for a clergy to be too numerous. This is not in all countries a mere danger of the past. Dr. Döllinger's work, from which we have already borrowed some remarks, might almost be called the "Black Book of the Churches;" so ruthless and (we must add) so one-sided, in some cases, is its treatment of the *de facto* condition of almost every Christian community. He complains that in the Papal States "an immense multitude of idle ecclesiastics were to be seen wasting their days in coffee-houses, and loitering in the street, passing their time in an unpriestly manner, so that a reverence for the entire order had very much diminished among the population." But we in England have no such danger. The open competition now instituted for appointments in India, in the army, and in the civil service, are a great attraction to parents. The fresh sources of distrust awakened by the publication of *Essays and Reviews* also tend to keep back some who might have proved to be valuable labourers. Nor is it quantity alone that is lacking; the social and intellectual standard is likewise being lowered. The wretchedly poor endowments of the new districts, so justly called "starvings" instead of "livings," have greatly diminished the average number of incumbencies. At this moment the average stipend of each English incumbent (even counting in the bishops and archbishops) is very decidedly below that enjoyed by each of the incumbents in the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland. Such facts tend to change the class from which the staple of the ministry is drawn. As human nature goes, low reward will, as a rule, have this effect. We have no right to expect that England should herein manifest any striking discrepancy from the results which have followed from the poverty of stipends in Roman Catholic France and in Calvinistic Scotland. There will now be a larger infusion of humbly-born and less highly-educated Clergy.

This last circumstance is not in itself an evil to be compared with lack of numbers. It may be that we have had too much leaning to the gentleman heresy, too much tendency to hold that a priest *must* be "a gentleman born," which Sir E. B. Lytton stigmatizes as "both an upstart and an insular opinion." And though the desire for intellect in the service of the ministry is more pardonable, yet even here there may lurk danger of unconsciously trusting to the arm of flesh. The two greatest geniuses of the Ante-Nicene Church, Origen and Tertullian, are the two whose aberrations have deprived their names of the honoured prefix of "saint." The powerful and versatile intellect of Abelard had far better have remained among the laity. How easily this list might be extended may be seen, alas! by a momentary glance at the pages of any Church history. It is far more serious to hear the complaint that our newly-ordained clergy dislike curacies where there are frequent services and celebrations of Holy Communion.

"Most fatal token of a falling age!
Wit ever busy, learning ever new,
Unsleeping fancy, eloquence untired :—
Prayer only dull!"

So wrote, nearly a quarter of a century ago, the poet of the *Christian Year*, in the *Lyra Apostolica*. Yet his words were the forerunners of a great revival. Why, then, should we despair? We have now looked in the face our dangers. Another time we will endeavour to suggest our remedies.



Modern Warfare.

UERY few years ago it was the common belief that war on a large scale had become improbable, and before long would become, under the altered state of society, impossible. The school of modern materialists, in deference to their own abstract theories, and in defiance of the conditions of humanity, went so far as to declare that the love itself of war was on the decline. The capitalist and the manufacturer predicted an universal free trade, and a large part of England, deceived if not enervated by their "forty years of rest," worshipped in the creation of the first crystal palace the symbol of a world-wide peace.

The deadly struggle in the Crimea was the first interruption to these dreams; but before the last echoes of that crash of their hopes and fancies had died away, the sounds of war were taken up on the plains of Lombardy, and the ancient conflict of the Latin and Teuton races was illustrated by battalions as powerful, and battle-scenes as bloody, as some of those which had inaugurated the first French Empire. But it did not end here; for, as though the spirit of carnage had been unchained, the war, which was barely suppressed amongst ourselves, abandoning its old haunts, has stalked forth, in more grim and colossal proportions, into a new land, which by some was fondly imagined to be the home of industry and peace, and where neither army nor navy, nor even the elements of modern war, were supposed to exist. Past military transactions seem dwarfed by the numbers of the combatants and the vastness of the empire for which they contend. Yet perhaps it may be questioned whether there is actually as great a difference either in the scale or in the conduct between the present and past wars as many are inclined to think. The vivid contrast in the United States now and formerly, in their present agonies of dismemberment and their former insolence of power, the unnatural character of the contest, the passions which it kindles, and the picturesque accounts of its incidents that we receive, awaken an interest which possibly leads us to overrate its magnitude. But vast as are the numbers which the spirit of democratic ambition has evoked for the forcible maintenance of the "Union," they fall far short of the 1,200,000 men whom the first Napoleon had under arms in the seventh year of an European contest; large as has been the issue of inconvertible paper for military purposes, it is not as yet equal to the prodigious flood of "assignats" on which for two or three years, instead of a few months as in America, the half-starved and half-clothed armies of France were led abroad to an almost universal conquest; large as may have been the loss of life in some recent engagements in America, or as it undoubtedly was at Solferino and Magenta, the numbers pale before those of the Revolutionary war. At Aspern, after two days' conflict, from 20,000 to 30,000, at Wagram 25,000, at the Borodino 50,000, at Leipsic, after three days' struggle, from 60,000 to 40,000 men fell fighting on either side.

Nor need the comparison end here. It might be pursued further, and to a singular conclusion. For first, the very circumstances which, it was predicted, would render future wars impossible have in reality tended to facilitate their operations; and secondly, by some strange fatality in the ever-turning wheel of human knowledge, there would seem to be a recurrence in the art of war to the earlier, perhaps the earliest, principles on which it was conducted. In the earthworks of Sebastopol, and the earthen fortifications recommended by Mr. Fergusson for the defence of Portsmouth, military science seems to run back the course of centuries, whilst in the huge cannon-balls, the heavy charges of powder, and Sir W. Armstrong's 300-pounders, we almost seem to revert to the marble-shot at the Dardanelles, which nearly sunk Sir J. Duckworth in the *Britannia* in 1812, or the huge ordnance of the 15th century, which the curious antiquarianism of our day has preserved.

In the very position which a fortress ought to occupy the modern has succumbed to the earlier theory. It was supposed that under the influence of improved gunnery the low and level range of a sea battery, *à fleur d'eau*, had superseded the forts which, like Dover Castle, or the picturesque strongholds of the Rhine, used to crown every rocky and inaccessible eminence; but the recent engagement near Richmond has once again vindicated the deadly superiority of a vertical fire. Even the proposed forts at Portsmouth have been recommended on this—and it must be added almost exclusively on this—ground. But by sea the analogy is yet closer. The screw and the paddle have made the modern war-steamer as independent of wind and tide as was the ancient trireme, and the manœuvres of a Thucydidean sea-fight, where ship wheeled around ship in order to find out a vulnerable point of attack, were some weeks since repeated on the waters of the Mississippi. By a not less curious coincidence the minie rifle, whilst it reproduced an accuracy of aim which had become unknown since the days of archery, was universally believed to have destroyed the use of armour, already rendered obsolete by the previous advances in the art of war. Yet within the last twelve months the protection of armour, though transferred from the individual to the thing, has been revived to an extent of which we never dreamed. More than this, an armour-plated pent-house was lately reported to exist in the Federal camp, which, resembling the *testudo* of classical times, or the moveable towers which Josephus has made familiar to us in the siege of Jerusalem, can be driven up to the very walls of a beleaguered fortress; whilst by sea, rams and iron-beaks and massive combinations of wood and metal,—the very type of Rome's naval architecture in her struggle with Carthage, and the cause of her successes—once more form the prominent feature of maritime warfare. Even the Greek fire of the Lower Empire, and the subtle powers of mediæval science, seem to revive in the *boulets asphyxiants*, the liquid gases, and the chemical combinations which the destructive ingenuity of man is continually bringing to light. It is worth noting how every branch of study is ransacked, every elemental force, from the electric fluid which explodes the torpedo, to the balloon which makes a reconnaissance in mid-air, is pressed into the service of military science; but the secrets of nature are not yet explored, and it may well be that we are touching upon an issue, at once horrible and ludicrous, where a few cubic inches of gas may submerge a fleet or annihilate an army.

How far, indeed, the analogy of modern and earlier warfare can be traced in the spirit which now governs the belligerent parties in North America, is a painful but not an irrelevant question. The brutality of a General Butler, or the deadly hatred which proposes to confiscate property or to kindle a servile war, which destroys an unoffending commerce, and brings “a silent blight” upon the cities of the South, rises to a height of deliberate ferocity which is worthy of the worst pages of Roman history. Fortunately, however, for the dignity and the interests of humanity, it is not unfair to believe that the American character is too far distorted from our own to hold up to us, in these things at least, a faithful mirror of our imperfections.

Mr. Buckle, whose early death is announced even whilst we write, and whom we may lament as an opponent whose antagonism in every field of thought, if it was irreconcilable, was open and undissembled, whilst labouring to prove a decrease in war and in the love of war, enumerates as the three moving causes in that direction, the discovery of gunpowder, steam communication, and a more extended acquaintance with the principles of political economy. But to those who have no preconceived theory to establish it will probably appear, on a calm review of existing facts, that whilst the last of these three influences is wholly powerless to restrain the violence of men, the two former have tended to increase rather than to diminish the facilities, and consequently the destructive powers, of war. The impartial reasonings of self-interest and the un-

questioned doctrines of political economy have melted like a snow-wreath under the hot passions which the lust of empire and the love of independence have kindled in America, whilst the transport of troops and the operations of a vast campaign have absolutely depended upon the efficiency of steam communication by sea and land.

Nor need the battles of modern Europe shrink from a comparison of their blood-stained honours with the conflicts of earlier times when gunpowder was unknown or unused. Here and there a battle of Chalons or of Tours may stand pre-eminent in carnage, but we can recall within the last 500 years few campaigns so bloody as that of Russia in 1812, which sacrificed 550,000 of the invaders, and no war so costly to human life as that of the Revolution, which decimated the population of France, and left its physical mark upon the existing generation by an actual diminution in the standard of height. Were it indeed desirable to pursue this argument, it should be borne in mind that those who fall in battle are but a fraction of the total number of victims that war in present or in past times has claimed.

It is not then without deep anxiety for the future destinies of this country that we see the conditions of war changing on every side of us, and the laws of attack and defence become wholly indefinite. We are too deeply interested in all that contributes to maintain or impair the defensibility of our insular position to be indifferent to so vital a question. It is, however, some consolation to Englishmen to observe that to whatever extent, and with whatever important results, mechanical agencies are applied to the art of modern war, the issue must still mainly be decided by the individual men engaged. As yet no royal road to military success has been discovered, and no science or mechanical invention are a substitute for courage, strength, and moral vigour. In the Italian campaign of Solferino and Magenta the “arms of precision,” and the fear of being picked off at a distance, drove both parties to close with each other, and to decide the day by bayonet-thrust and by a hand-to-hand struggle as fierce and unscientific as any in the days of “brown Bess;” whilst in America it is clear, even through the cloud of Northern exaggeration and bombast, that the ill-armed levies of the South have gained or disputed each victory by the desperate courage and personal gallantry of their men. It is true that we are passing through a revolution of opinion as regards the practice and art of war, and that time alone can solve many questions in which is involved the security of the Empire. How far, indeed, the means of attack and defence may predominate the one over the other, how far the gigantic expense of modern armaments can be reconciled with the solvency of the nations concerned, or will tend to absorb war itself, these and such-like are questions which we dare not answer, when we have seen within the last few months the public mind vibrate between the extremities of contradictory opinions at each fresh touch of American intelligence from the theatre of war. But so long as Englishmen retain the physical and moral organization of their forefathers, and are true to the traditions of their race and history, they have a buckler which is proof against every mechanical or scientific device. For Science owes its being to Man, and not Man to Science, and therefore Man will still be the lord of his own creation.

The Way of Unity.



It is clear that there has arisen of late years in many quarters, and in many sections of the Church, a longing after the restoration of Unity. Several of the plans proposed for this object are not such as can lead to its accomplishment. And yet their existence testifies to the fact, and proves the extent of this desire. Nor is this all: we know by experience that it is according to the analogy of God's dealings with mankind, that when the time approaches for any great step

to be taken in human progress, it has usually, if not always, been indicated by preceding endeavours, which have served to point out the direction of the current of men's minds. So that the existence of these indications at the present time may be taken as an encouragement, even though the endeavours themselves may be inadequate or defective.

As to the amazing importance of unity in religion little need be said. Passing by the Scriptural obligation, and the exhortation and warning of our Lord and His apostles, which belong, perhaps, more properly to another place and time, the evils of disunion are sufficiently apparent. How it hinders individual progress in vital godliness, how it distracts the mind of inquirers between different views of Divine truth, how it even tends to promote scepticism by the difficulty of discovering what is truth, how it arrays classes of men against other classes, how it affects politically and socially the good order and well-being of society, how it hinders missionary work, and tends to the propagation of the same divisions with their attendant evils, all these things are patent among ourselves. But if we take a wider scope, and regard the Christian Church at large, we find many of these evils intensified. And all this serves to show how vast is the importance of recovering, if it be possible, the unity we have lost.

But is it possible? Certainly we have been so accustomed to look upon our divisions as inevitable, knowing that they are the inheritance of bygone ages for which we are not responsible, that it seems chimerical to attempt to remedy what we are forced to accept as a fact and deal with as we can. But, on the other hand, it can do no harm, to say the least, to attempt to trace the way by which so great a blessing might be attained.

And there are three ways towards the accomplishment of this object, which present themselves to our minds in the consideration of this subject. The first way is by means of a general council; the second by internal reform and restitution within our own communion; the third and final step by compact and amalgamation with the sects that are now in a state of separation.

In speaking of the first of these courses we are not to be understood to refer to what has sometimes been called a Pan-Anglican council. It might or might not be expedient to hold such a council. There may something be said in favour of it, while many objections might be stated. But with a view to the future restoration of unity to Christendom, it is plain that there must be a general council in the proper sense of the word, not such as the Court of Rome may call by that name, but in which the whole Church, East and West, may be represented, including on the one hand the Nestorian, Armenian, and Coptic Churches, on the other the Anglican branches, as well as the more exclusively Protestant communities. It may seem beyond the range of present possibility that such an assemblage should take place. Certainly there is no prospect of it as yet. But when men's minds are turned towards an object, they will begin to contemplate the ways by which it may be attained; and in view of that object it is certain that the most effectual way of regaining unity even amongst ourselves would be if our Church were reunited with every other branch of universal Christendom.

If ever, therefore, it should please God to dispose the minds of Christian princes and Christian states towards such an assembly with such an object, it must be a matter to be insisted on by the Church of England that we should be represented at the Council. Not that absolute uniformity can be hoped, if even wished for, in all branches of the Christian Church, nor that good can be hoped for from a council which should meet with that object in view. What might be hoped for is that differences might be so far adjusted as that the Churches of different countries might acknowledge one another, and that intercommunion might, at least to some degree, be re-established among them. But to this end, the preliminary step must be that the Pope should abandon his claim to preside, at least as of right, and that the acknowledgment of his supremacy should extend no further than those Churches by whom it is now admitted. And as this supremacy is now claimed

as of divine right, it is obvious that here is the great difficulty, and that the Court of Rome is still, as it has always been, the great obstacle in the way of unity.

But if this were overcome, speaking now hypothetically, what would be likely to follow is this. The Church of England would be able to show that she has not foregone any part of the Divine deposit, and that her claim to be a true and living branch of the Universal Church, is at least as good as that of other Churches. And when this was acknowledged in such an assembly as we are contemplating, the result to ourselves and to our countrymen in general would be very great indeed. Objections would be raised and discussed, difficulties would be pointed out, a desire would be engendered in our statesmen and among ourselves to remedy acknowledged evils, and the people at large would be impressed by the sight of so grave and venerable an assemblage, and would be prepared to return to those conditions of unity which should be so prescribed.

A splendid dream—the dream of an enthusiast! But when was anything great or good ever yet achieved without some sparks of that enthusiasm which breaks the spell of impossibility by counting all things possible?

We have the authority of one of the ablest of our own English primates, Archbishop Wake, for indicating the way by which intercommunion might be restored between different branches of the Church, and there is hardly any authority among us less open to suspicion. Archbishop Wake's correspondence with some of the doctors of the Sorbonne, such as Dupin and de Girardin, on this subject, may be found in the Appendix to the fifth volume of Maclaine's *Mosheim*, and has been lately reprinted in that most interesting periodical *L'Union Chrétienne*, which is devoted to the restoration of Gallican principles within the Church of France, but which extends its sympathies beyond that communion, to the Eastern Churches in particular, and, to some considerable extent, to our own. His words are these:—

“The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail is, to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every National Church or any others; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; and for points of doctrine, to agree as far as possible in all articles of any moment (as in effect we either already do or easily may), and for other matters, to allow a difference till God shall bring us to a union in this also.” The suggestion which follows appears to us to be loose and very dangerous; and it is just at this point where the real difficulty would arise. “One thing only should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the Church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the service of the Church, that so, whenever any come from us to them, or from them to us, we may all join together in prayers and in the holy sacraments with each other.”

The time may come when it may be held to be providential that the earlier part of this quotation should have been expressed by an Archbishop of Canterbury, now almost a century and a-half ago. And it is not less remarkable that the same archbishop should have deliberately expressed another sentiment which may possibly even yet become of the highest importance. He was reproached for having said in his first work on convocation, *The Authority of Christian Princes, &c.*, that there might arise an occasion when it might become the prelates of the Church of England, if liberty were denied them of meeting in Synod, to incur all hazards and to meet notwithstanding. But he was so far from shrinking from this assertion, that in his second and larger work, *The State of the Church and Clergy, &c.*, he reiterates the same assertion in the most emphatic and unequivocal manner. And when we consider that Wake was a Whig in politics, was promoted by the Whigs, and was mainly instrumental by his writings in justifying the first suspension of our synods, the weight of such testimony cannot be too highly estimated. Indeed, it is said that he afterwards wished, when archbishop, to hold a session of Convocation, but found the power which he had evoked too strong for him.

By the providence of God, the Church of England has at length regained her liberty in this respect, and it does not seem likely that any power will be sufficient to deprive her of it again, even if the wish should exist, which we are far from believing. And if ever the time should come when there should be a question of a general council, we may be sure that the government of the day will make no difficulty about the attendance of the bishops of the Church of England.

The case was different after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, when the Church of England was invited to send deputies to the Council of Trent, but refused. That was not a general council in the proper sense. It was summoned by authority of the Pope alone, it contained no representation of the Eastern Churches, and to recognize it was to violate the principles on which we had taken our stand. If the world shall ever see another council, calling itself general, it will be of a different kind.

Rise of the Latitudinarian School.

LATITUDINARIAN is one whose opinions hang loosely about him. With him there is nothing solid, compact, and precise. He requires more room than others because his wares are not so neatly stowed. He cannot tell you what room he needs because he does not know his own possessions. He is disinclined to take stock of them or to ascertain what their true amount and uses are. He is satisfied to hold opinions without adopting them and to profess a creed without realizing it. He shrinks from logical consequences and is wilfully blind to legitimate results. Finding opinions cumbersome and unmeaning, he learns to undervalue and disparage them. In his view they are objectionable because they are inconvenient. He hates to make up his mind and dreads to take a side. He would hold all things slackly rather than be obliged to decide about any. In matters of taste, science, or history, this habit of mind may be venial though it can hardly not be mischievous; but in matters of revelation it is not so. In the former the Latitudinarian may be sometimes simply a failure, in the latter he is always something more. To be loose and undecided here is a habit of mind inconsistent with faith, and hence destructive of religion. To be disinclined to face the consequences of creeds is to do dishonour to the creeds, because it implies they will not bear their consequences.

The rise of this school of theology belongs to a marked period in our Church history. It had its birth when opinions were highly penal and thoughts and creeds made subjects of censure. The grand error of the Romanist, based upon the fundamental fallacy of the infallibility of his Church, had been transmitted to the religious bodies which were no longer in communion with Rome. A church which owed much to the exercise of the duty of private judgment was seen using its hereditary control over the weapons of the state to inflict penalties for the abuse of private judgment. It burnt men at the stake, mutilated, imprisoned, and fined them for false, mischievous, and blasphemous opinions. Without pausing to consider whether this policy is capable of defence, we may note this effect of it. It gave a distinct and enormous importance to opinions. These which we now treat as unfit subjects for coercion and penalty were then regarded and dealt with as calling either for the most active encouragement or the sternest repression. And out of this an impression was produced on the moral nature of good and intelligent men. The qualities of compassion, benevolence, and tenderness, came into play to regulate matters of thought and opinion. Some thinking men began to shrink from decisions altogether, because those decisions must either throw them into the ranks of the persecutors or the persecuted. To the intellectual difficulties of a complete conviction moral difficulties were superadded, and the obstacles to a distinct and heartily-embraced creed were immensely increased. The

consequences of opinions were such as some men of great powers could not bear to face, and hence they shrank from admitting those consequences. They would rather be illogical than unmerciful, rather betray their head than their heart. They looked upon the opinions of others rather from a moral than an intellectual point of view, trying them by the standard of compassion rather than that of truth, and thus they partially adopted what intellectually they could not defend. To excuse this they disparaged opinions altogether, and began to teach that one judgment in religion was as good as another, provided it were honestly formed. The first great apostle of these views in England was Chillingworth. "I will think no man," says he, "the worse man or the worse Christian for differing in opinion from me." The thought is charitable, but its consequences are mischievous. It was better, perhaps, than the severities which suggested it, but it was full of danger. What was the effect of an ill-regulated benevolence upon the intellect of Chillingworth his friend Lord Clarendon tells us:—"He contracted such an irresolution and habit of doubting that by degrees he grew confident of nothing, and a sceptic at least in the greatest mysteries of faith." The contemporary and friend of Chillingworth was John Hales of Eton, who divided with him the doubtful honour of originating Latitudinarianism in England. In Hales, too, there was a moral foundation for his low estimate of the importance of doctrinal views. "He would often say," says Clarendon, "that he would renounce the religion of the Church of England to-morrow if it obliged him to believe that any other Christians should be damned." We observe in him the habit of mind which, offended with the penalties attached to opinions, runs into the opposite mistake of holding all opinions alike valuable. Thus, in his tract on Schism, he treats heresy as only culpable in so far as it is a sin of the will, and the guilt of schism he lays upon the shoulders of Church governors who exclude men from communion on (what he considers) insufficient grounds. "I do not see," says Mr. Hales, "why men of different opinions in Christian religion may not hold communion *in sacris* and both go to one church. Why may not I, if occasion require, go to an Arian church, so there be no Arianism expressed in their liturgy; and were liturgies and public forms of service so framed as that they admitted not of particular and private fancies, but contained only such things as in which all Christians do agree, schisms on opinion were utterly vanished." The comprehension for which reasoning of this class contends has stopped short of Arianism and Socinianism in almost every case; and yet it is obvious that, upon its own principle of claiming to discard so much of dogma as does not suit it, the exclusion is not consistent and destroys the reasoning. The internecine strife of the period of the Rebellion followed quickly upon the publication of the views of Chillingworth and Hales, and for a time arrested Latitudinarianism. To hold opinions slackly was then cowardice, and religious strife was invested with an exceptional honour. Yet from the exhaustion which succeeded that outbreak of enthusiasm quickly degenerating into fanaticism, were developed some peculiar forms of Latitudinarianism which need our attention. The first was that of Jeremy Taylor. The *Liberty of Prophesying* was published in 1647, and was the first English theological treatise which advocated toleration. In this Taylor was beyond and above his time, and is worthy of all admiration. Yet, in advocating the duty of toleration, Taylor draws many arguments from the difficulty of ascertaining truth, and in some parts of his treatise almost seems to speak the language of an universal scepticism. Himself no Latitudinarian, he yet appears to argue as one, because, even in his view of toleration, the whole care of religion was still charged upon the state. It was necessary, therefore, for him to ascertain the doctrinal limits to which a Christian ruler might go, and to examine and test opinions to see if they were absolutely inadmissible. Hence, desiring to be as capacious as possible, he eliminates all but the most fundamental verities, and thus has the appearance of recasting creeds on the most liberal model. Another

form of Latitudinarianism developed by the Rebellion troubles was that of Richard Baxter. He thought that Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Independent, and Anabaptist might combine on the common ground of discipline and zeal, sinking doctrine altogether, and that a united Church might be formed on the principle of agreeing to differ. Like Taylor, Baxter was no Latitudinarian in his own views, but he advocated a system which appears to be utterly inconsistent with any hearty regard for truth. But the school of Hales and Chillingworth was now to receive a great impulse, and to draw to it some of the finest minds in the country. A small knot of thoughtful men at Cambridge had already attracted attention before the end of the Protectorate, and the great popularity and high reputation of Dr. Wilkins served to add to their views notoriety and acceptance. The names of Henry More and Worthington, of Cudworth and Whichcot received a fresh lustre when Wilkins migrated from Wadham to Trinity, Cambridge, and at once joined their coterie. Wilkins was the most distinguished Latitudinarian of his age, and in him, too, laxity of opinion was greatly due to charitable-ness of disposition. Committed to the fanatical party by his marriage with the sister of Cromwell he yet rose above his associates, and by his influence at Oxford availed to shield the university somewhat from the bitterness of Owen and Goodwin. He had learned to shrink from supporting the persecuting rancour of the Independents, and at the Restoration he was equally averse to the ruthless policy of an exasperated House of Commons. By the same process as Hales he was led to undervalue opinions, and, when commissioned to treat with the Nonconformists on the question of compromise, he declared plainly that, for his part, this or that point in the Prayer-book made but a very trifling difference. The passage in which Bishop Burnet describes the small band of Cambridge philosophers who, with Wilkins at their head, first obtained the name of Latitudinarians is well known. This name, he tells us, was fastened on them by "men of narrower thoughts and fiercer tempers." In his view they were worthy of all honour as "studying to take men off from being in parties, from narrow notions, from superstitious conceits, and from a fierceness about opinions." (*Own Time*, p. 128, ed. 1838.) And if the philosophical latitude of the academical speculators may be somewhat excused by the fanatical bitterness of their time, so may also that of their successors in the history of Latitudinarianism by the persecuting rigours under which they lived. Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Louth, were active London clergy, employed in labouring to re-establish the Church system in the affections of the nation, while the Parliament and Government were making it odious by persecuting laws. Naturally, perhaps, though short-sightedly, they would look towards compromise as the only hope of deliverance from the obstacles which confronted them; but some of these divines at least were not slack in holding and advocating distinctive opinions. With the Revolution the excuse for Latitudinarianism passed away, but the thing itself increased. Toleration once granted, no man need tamper with opinions on the ground of charity or maim creeds to stay persecution; but yet looseness of opinion grew and multiplied. What was produced in former times by a commendable motive was now due to false sentiment and mock liberality, which thinly disguised gross carelessness and grievous ignorance. The theology of the eighteenth century is a perpetual apology for holding any Christian opinions whatever, and the divines of that time were far too polished and enlightened to press any distinctive dogmas against the well-turned emptinesses of the Deist. Latitudinarianism has here done its appropriate work of reducing religious teaching to the mere common-places of a vapid morality, and men are feebly exhorted to live virtuous lives, without the indication of a motive to quicken them or a source of help to strengthen them. The religious revival of the nineteenth century has in several phases of it taken effect on the side of the feelings rather than the understanding, and hence has sometimes left Latitudinarianism untouched while quickening into action the spiritual impulses so long

torpid. This is at best but an imperfect work. Without distinct and cherished opinions, a creed heartily embraced and earnestly held, no healthy uniform and sustained religious action is possible. The school of the Latitudinarians, due in its origin to kindly impulses which now no longer need its aid, can scarcely in our day commend itself to honest, thoughtful, and earnest men.

Court of Final Ecclesiastical Appeal.



ANY and signal blessings are secured to this nation by the maintenance of the ancient union between Church and State. Indeed, how the civil power of a Christian nation can perform its highest duties towards the people without accepting and maintaining a definite form of faith, and, on the other hand, how a Church can satisfactorily fulfil all its proper functions without the countenance and protection of the civil power, it is not easy to understand. However, from this union so advantageous to both complications will sometimes arise, which, unless prudently dealt with, may entail not only grave inconveniences, but produce serious and alarming evils.

Among those evils must be reckoned that of the encroachment of one jurisdiction upon the other, by a confusion between spiritual and temporal authority; a subject which engaged Sir Edward Coke's attention when he thus wrote:—"Certain it is that this kingdom hath been best governed, and peace and quiet preserved, when both parties, that is, the Justices of the temporal Courts and the ecclesiastical Judges have kept themselves within their proper jurisdictions, without encroaching or usurping one upon another: and, when such encroachments or usurpations have been made, they have been the seeds of great trouble and inconvenience."

Such seeds of trouble and inconvenience have certainly been sown in England by the modern legislation which governs Ecclesiastical Appeals in the final resort, and which refers them to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, statutorily a purely lay tribunal; not one single spiritual person being a member of the Court under the terms of the Act which constituted it. That tribunal consists of the following persons:—The President of the Privy Council, the Lord Chancellor, and such members of the Privy Council as hold any of the following offices:—Lord Keeper, Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Master of the Rolls, Vice-Chancellor of England, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, Judge of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty, Chief Judge of the Court in Bankruptcy, also all members of the Privy Council who have been President of that body, or have been Lord Chancellor, or have held any of the other offices before mentioned; and further power is given to the Crown to appoint any two other Privy Councillors to be members of the Judicial Committee.

Such is the ordinary Court (for we need not here advert to exceptional cases arising under the Clergy Discipline Act, and to those touching the King) of final Ecclesiastical Appeal established in England by a recent statute, (A. D. 1833,) and certainly, from its constitution, no one spiritual person appearing among its members, that Court hardly commends itself as a fit tribunal to deal in the last resort with deep mysteries of faith and abstruse questions of theological learning.

Attempts have indeed been made to put a fairer face upon this tribunal, by joining, on occasion, some prelates in its deliberations. But such a course is a mere makeshift, and is not legally required. Nor, even if it were, would the result be valuable; because, against a mixed tribunal of temporal and spiritual authority for the purposes under view, the gravest objections exist. However,

into that matter it is hardly necessary to enter, for we are viewing the subject constitutionally, and the Court as established by law consists only of the materials above specified.

The course of Ecclesiastical Appeal which now prevails, excepting only the case of this final tribunal, has existed through many centuries of our history. Indeed, so early as in the year 1164 that course was distinctly laid down by the Constitutions of Clarendon—"from the Archdeacon to the Bishop—from the Bishop to the Archbishop;" and, "if the Archbishop fails to do justice, recourse may be had to the King, by whose order the controversy is to be finally decided in the Archbishop's Court. Neither shall it be lawful for either of the parties to move for any further remedy [*i. e.* to appeal to Rome] without leave from the Crown." Here it is plain that, if the Archbishop failed in doing justice, recourse might be had to the Crown; but then the cause was still to be determined in the Archbishop's Court, it was not to be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Church, and the proceedings were to be governed by the methods of the Court Christian. Thus, at that time, the final hearing of a spiritual cause belonged within the realm to the Court of the Archbishop; though, with royal consent, it might thence be carried to Rome.

A change, however, in the law occurred in the year 1533. The Church and nation were then engaged in emancipating themselves from all Roman usurpations, and in that year the permissive appeal to Rome (contingent on the royal assent, as legalized by the Constitutions of Clarendon) was abolished by 24 Hen. VIII. 12. 6, and thus the final resort in causes Ecclesiastical, without any qualification, now lay to the Archbishop's Court.

This state of things, however, did not long abide; for in 1534 another change was effected by 25 Henry VIII. 19. 4, and it was then enacted that from the Archbishop's Court there should lie an appeal to the Crown in Chancery, and that certain persons should be thence appointed to decide definitively upon the case. The persons so appointed were called delegates, and from them this tribunal received the name of the Court of Delegates.

It is observable, however, that by a considerable strain on the Constitution, and a stretch of the Royal prerogative, effected by some mysterious subtleties of interpretation, the decisions of the Court of Delegates were sometimes submitted to the revision of what was termed a Court of Review. But as this tribunal had never any statutable warranty, and as its authority rested on remarkably slender foundations, it can hardly be considered to have exercised a rightful jurisdiction.

The Court of Delegates remained as the final statutable Appeal Court down to 1832. In that year it was annihilated by 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 92. s. 1. And an appeal from the Archbishop's Court was then transferred to the Crown in Council; *i. e.* to the whole Privy Council.

But this change seems to have proved unsatisfactory; for, in the following year, 1833, instead of the Privy Council, the Statute 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 41. substituted in its place (though, as we believe, quite unintentionally on the part of our legislators, as regards spiritual causes) the Judicial Committee of Privy Council as the tribunal of final resort, which at this hour receives appeals in ordinary cases from the Archbishops' Courts.

We have detailed above the members who compose this Court of final spiritual appeal; and never since its establishment, in 1833, has any satisfaction whatsoever been expressed, by persons capable of forming just opinions, with its qualifications for the functions assigned to it in matters ecclesiastical. And not only so, but the greatest dissatisfaction has been the result. For though this subject has not received much public attention lately, yet a few years back our most eminent statesmen and divines made strenuous endeavours, though unhappily without success, to redress the grievance. In the year 1847 the late revered Bishop of London introduced a Bill into the House of Lords with the object of substituting some other tribunal for the Judicial Committee. The principle of

the Bill was assented to by a Select Committee of that House, and it was reintroduced as amended by that Committee in the Sessions of 1848-9. From various causes the matter stood over until 1850, when, in the early part of the year, a fresh Bill was brought in varying in some particulars, but still having the same object embodied in its provisions—a reconstruction of the Final Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal. That Bill was, however, withdrawn, as it was thought fit to make this matter the subject of a distinct Statute, and, with a view of preparing it, the Archbishop of Canterbury called together the Bishops of England and Wales. The meeting was attended by twenty-five out of the twenty-eight prelates of the two provinces, and the result was an almost unanimous conclusion that a fresh Bill should be introduced to transfer final appeals in matters spiritual from the Judicial Committee to another tribunal.

That Bill was introduced on the 3rd of June, 1850, and the memorable debate which ensued is still fresh in the memory of many who are interested in the subject. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, the late Bishop of London, the Bishop of Oxford, the late Duke of Cambridge, the Earl of Derby, Lord Lyttelton, Lord Redesdale, and others, took part in it. And all those prelates and noblemen distinctly advocated a change in this branch of our judicial system. However, the opposition of the Government then in power proved fatal to the Bill; and so to this time that which was admitted to be a grievance, even by those who opposed the particular measure before the House, has been perpetuated.

The complaints against the present Court, and, in our opinion, very just complaints, are,—1. That it is incompetent to the duties assigned to it. For the members, eminent as they are in other branches of learning, cannot reasonably be supposed to be well-skilled in divinity.—2. That, consequently, under the present system there is no security for the maintenance of sound doctrine.—3. That dissenters may be members of the Court, and that for defining the faith of the English Church such authority is inadmissible.—4. That the present system is an anomaly and runs counter to the whole course of English jurisprudence. For when any question involving matters of faith comes before a temporal court, the practice has been for that court to surcease from action, and refer the spiritual matter to an Ecclesiastical Court for decision. But now the matter so referred may, when ruled by the Ecclesiastical Court, be appealed against to the Judicial Committee, —a temporal court. And thus a contradiction is involved which is singularly discreditable to our judicial system.—5. That spiritual matters are referred to a lay-tribunal; and that such a course is against the original constitution of the Church of Christ as established by our Lord Himself, against the example of the early ages, against the practice of Christian empires, against the concurrent testimony of all trustworthy authorities, and is a breach of the compact between the Church and State of this country. All these objections may be indisputably proved by abundant testimony, which want of space forbids us here to specify in detail.

It is, indeed, sometimes said, but we most emphatically deny the assertion, that, as the Court is not a court of construction, but only of interpretation, no grievance exists. It is urged that the doctrines of the Church of England are fixed by her formularies, that the Tribunal in question has only to apply the legal meaning of those formularies to the case in hand, and that for such a purpose a temporal court is sufficiently qualified. But no one can be ignorant that judgments in final courts do virtually make law under guise of interpretation. Precedents in courts carry with them a mysterious authority very apt to bind subsequent decisions. And in this case the greatest danger exists lest decisions on matters of doctrine should prevail to rule, at least in judicial regards, the doctrines themselves. Such effects are practically almost inseparable from the jurisdiction of a final appeal court.

Under such circumstances it must be confessed that the Court does virtually assume the function of the "teaching

of the Word," which was exclusively confined by our Lord's own commission and by the practice of the primitive Church to the spirituality. For the effect and end of its decisions are to govern that teaching throughout the National Church. The Court thus affects a teaching of larger influence, of wider effect, and of more impressive authority, than the teaching of any individual or any number of individual preachers, however learned, however eloquent; for it is directed to prevail throughout the whole region of the Church's instructions whenever or wherever given. And this is in reality an assumption of synodical powers which ill befits such a tribunal as the Judicial Committee of Privy Council.

Indeed, that the Church should "*be free and subject to her own judgments*" is a principle which lies at the very foundation of the Constitutional compact. It was specially expressed in the act of one of the Saxon councils, that of Brasted, so early as in the year 696. It is the key-stone of Magna Charta. It received national confirmation in the reigns of Kings Henry III, Edward I, Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, and that not once, twice, or thrice only, but many times repeated. It was renewed by the Statute *Articuli Cleri*, and by the Royal ratification at the head of the Thirty-nine Articles in our Prayer-books. It has been confirmed by the repeated Coronation oaths of sovereigns. It stands ratified by that resolution of the legislature, abiding still in full force upon the statute rolls, reciting the nation as "a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of persons," and adding "the body spiritual whereof having power when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politic called the spirituality now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath always been thought and is also at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons, to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain." And yet this compact so often renewed, so frequently and so solemnly confirmed, is set aside by the Privy Council Act.

We are quite prepared to admit that there are difficulties in constituting a tribunal of final appeal for causes which at the same time involve questions of faith and questions of property, so as to secure the just authority of the State, and at the same time to preserve inviolate the proper jurisdiction of the Church. But we are by no means prepared to admit that those difficulties are insuperable. The State, it is said, wielding the sword, will never, in causes involving such mixed elements, consent to part with judgment in the last resort. Now let this for the moment be fully conceded. Yet it does not appear but that a plan in entire accordance with our whole system of English jurisprudence might be adopted, securing final judgment to the State, and yet, at the same time, respecting the conscience and preserving the just claims of the Church as regards faith and doctrine.

The principle *cuique in sua arte credendum* governs the whole range of our jurisprudence. In accordance with that principle the Courts of Equity send issues to the Common law courts for instruction on questions of common law. Common law courts surcease from action when questions of doctrine are involved, and await decisions in Ecclesiastical courts. The Admiralty Court seeks information from professional sailors. All courts, in questions of foreign law, or of science, have recourse to experts in the respective branches of learning involved. And if this principle were adopted in the proceedings of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, and if that tribunal were to consult the spirituality on questions of faith and doctrine, it would not only act in accordance with the whole tenor of our judicial system, but would relieve itself from responsibilities which no way rightly belong to it, and which few persons think it at all competent satisfactorily to discharge. A very sensible advantage would also be se-

cured by such an arrangement. The doctrine in question would then stand out clear from the facts and law of the case under view, free from that unhappy admixture which has been found painfully embarrassing; and if in any case the final judgment of the court should not appear to be in accordance with the answer returned by the spirituality, still the doctrine involved would be untouched by the decision. The answer returned by the spirituality would then be the expression of the Church's faith, irrespective of the particular event of the contention under hand.

The question, of course, immediately arises, Who are the spirituality? To what authority could such questions be rightly submitted? Now, in a case of final judgment involving matter of such deep importance as the national faith, it may occur to some minds that the same authority should be invoked for interpretation as is charged with construction. That, as every one of competent information knows, is the united Synod of our two provinces. But it may be said that to obtain their judgment on a point of doctrine would involve complicated machinery and engender delay. Still, if these objections were allowed to prevail, though we are not sure that they are so formidable as may appear at first sight, yet it has been the practice in all ages of the Church to act *per viam compromissi*, and a body of divines might well be appointed by those two assemblies to whom the Judicial Committee of Privy Council might refer questions of doctrine with perfect confidence of obtaining a true exposition of the Church's faith, in any case which was submitted for judgment.

Thus the Privy Council, as at present, would abide as the Court of Final Appeal, but doctrinal questions would be submitted to that authority which alone, according to the constitution of the Christian Church, and the compact between the Church and State of England, is empowered to decide them. And such a plan as this, we think, has far fairer promise of a good issue than any endeavour, as has been sometimes suggested, to constitute as an ultimate tribunal a Court half temporal and half spiritual. The association of ecclesiastical members with a civil court, or, on the other hand, the association of lay members with an ecclesiastical court, are but clumsy and most unsatisfactory expedients, neither warranted by primitive practice, nor consistent with ecclesiastical proprieties, nor calculated to produce harmonious results. From such connections there cannot but be generated a hybrid and ill-favoured progeny, which, it must be said, some records of our past history do not commend at all hopefully for adoption. And, moreover, the final decision of such a mixed court in questions of faith and doctrine will never be accepted, by any one who understands and honours her constitution, as the final decision of the Church of England.

There are provisions in the two Acts which constituted the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, as the Court of final appeal in ecclesiastical causes, which might perhaps prevail to secure some such remedy as that which we have pointed out, without having recourse to fresh legislation. Upon a careful perusal and comparison of them, it appears that powers are already therein conferred to regulate by Orders in Council the proceedings of that tribunal. And it is worthy of the consideration of our statesmen whether by such Orders regulations might not be made which would satisfy the requirements of the State and the conscience of the Church, thus consigning in the last resort the correction of offences, and the rights of property to the arbitration of the civil power, and meanwhile providing for the due interpretation of the faith by those to whose guardianship it has been by God committed. Upon such principles—the things of Cæsar being rendered to Cæsar, those of God to God; the sword of Constantine being united to that of Peter—a lasting union between a Christian State and a Christian Church will be most firmly cemented, and most surely maintained.



Mission-Houses in Rural Districts.

DURING the Debates in Convocation, in February last, an expression dropped from one of the members which rather startled his brethren, when he spoke of the parochial system not only as the strength, but also as the *weakness* of the National Church. We have been pondering on this expression, and think we may be useful in pointing out one respect at least in which it is true.

There are, in many parts of the country, parishes of very wide extent. We have been informed of parishes in the Dioceses of Durham and of Lichfield of not less than a hundred miles in circuit. We know of one in the Diocese of Lincoln of fifty miles, and of several in Lincoln and in Ely approaching to the same size. It is a wide exercise of charity to assume that all of these parishes are blessed with an able, vigorous, and efficient ministry; and if we can find only one with a sluggish or indifferent parish priest, we must be sure that that one is a source of *weakness* to the National Church.

For the theory of the parochial system is this: not only to give a parish to every beneficed priest, but to give a priest to every individual within the limits of the benefice. The relationship of the parish priest to his people is such as to give every member of his flock a right of access to him in his spiritual character; and, if he leaves any one of them in ignorance of this right, he fails to fulfil his obligation towards the whole parish entrusted to him. Wherever this relationship is realized by pastor and people, it becomes a mighty power for good; wherever it fails to be realized (entirely apart from the question of its being occasionally denied), it lessens the vitality and *weakens* the influence of the National Church.

Our present remarks must leave out of sight altogether those unfulfilled responsibilities amid dense populations in towns, for which a stern necessity, or what has been cleverly called "the inexorable logic of facts," is the only justification, and the real palliation; but they will point to a practical remedy for the inefficiency that exists in many cases in wide-spread rural parishes.

We are no justifiers of an indolent or careless ministry; but we can imagine the plausible excuse set up by many well-intentioned men, in such large parishes as we have indicated, for a thinly-attended parish church, and an ignorant and unvisited flock. They will tell us that when they came into the parish they visited every house in it: but that the men were all at work in the fields or farm-yards, the women all engaged in household cares; that their visits were not encouraged; that the church was too far away for the people to attend; and that there was no school within reach for the children to go to. And with this salve to their conscience, that they had tried to do what they could, and had found it very little, they sit down for the rest of their days, leaving their distant parishioners to a chance call, or an occasional visit when they hear of any one being sick!

We fear this represents the case of many a wide-spread rural parish with a scattered population; and we hail with joy indications of a practical remedy to meet this state of things, which is a discredit to the National Church, and a fosterer of dissent among the more religious-minded of an ignorant peasantry.

We have before us the Reports of the Church Building Society for 1859, 1860, and 1861; and we find in each of them a list of grants from the "Special Fund for School-Churches and Mission-Houses." In 1859 the grants made were fifteen in number; in 1860 they had increased to twenty-five; in 1861 they had increased to twenty-seven (notwithstanding that two—Tenterden and Yarmouth—seem to have dropped from some cause out of the list, or not to have claimed their grants); and we learn that they now number twenty-nine, in addition to

some half-dozen Mission-Houses built in other parishes without any aid from the Society.

There is, then, a NEW AGENCY at work in from thirty to forty of our English and Welsh parishes (for the principality, judging from such names as Cromtwich, Llanelly, and Mynydd, seems forward in the movement) which is calculated to supplement the existing deficiency of the parochial system, to eliminate its element of *weakness*, and to develop its full power in the National Church.

And now let us look at this Mission-House scheme a little more closely, and test its efficiency by facts. What is it, and how does it work?

The design of the Mission-House is to establish a new *locus in quo*: a new centre of operations from which a distant parish-priest may work any hitherto inaccessible district of his parish. He has there a station, where he can gather the scattered neighbours together for pastoral instruction, at least on one evening on a week-day, if not for Divine service on Sunday: where he can establish a school, of a nature suitable to the wants of the locality: where he can find a place of rest and refreshment for himself in his *own* room whenever so disposed; keep a change of raiment for wet weather; and hold a confirmation-class, or scripture-class, at any appointed hour; and above all, where he can *regularly* visit, once at least in every week, at some stated time, so that the outlying parishioners of the quarter may always know when and where to find a spiritual guide and friend.

We have been favoured with Reports from several districts that have tried the experiment in the Dioceses of Norwich, Lincoln, and Ely. The facts to which we shall refer are drawn exclusively from the last-named diocese.

In two of the three districts under our present observation Mission-Houses have been built; in the third a School-Church only: the difference being that the Mission-House has a residence attached, where a school teacher resides, and a room is set apart for the clergyman's exclusive use on his visitations: the School-Church is without this useful addition. Every one of these districts reports a new congregation formed in the locality; satisfactory in numbers, and exceeding the anticipations of the incumbent. Every one reports a new School, flourishing in numbers and usefulness: two of them report their numbers severally at seventy-eight and eighty; and the report of the third, not naming the number, is to the following effect:—"The want of the means of education had been so long and severely felt, that when the boon was granted it was highly prized; and the regularity and punctuality in attendance during the six months the School has been in operation, and the willingness with which a rate of payment *higher than that required in the town* is made, manifest their appreciation of the value of education." Every one reports a general renovation in the district of the new building; a more decorous observance of the Sunday; the desertion of the "idle corner" near the public house; an improved tone of moral feeling; a marked elevation of the children; a diminution of dissent; an advance in self-respect; and a revival in the love for the Church and the ordinances thereof.

In two of the foregoing instances the services in the Mission-Houses are solemnized exclusively by the parochial clergy; but in the third, an outlying hamlet fully six miles distant from the parish church, which is in the centre of a large town, the service is sometimes conducted by a layman, who reads a sermon selected by the vicar of the parish. To some this may seem objectionable: but, if we draw a right inference from the Debate in Convocation on readers and sub-deacons, the practice meets with a more favourable reception now than it would have experienced twenty years ago. The result is undoubtedly favourable both to the growth of religion and the influence of the Church in the neighbourhood.

From the facts we have now stated it would seem plain that the great want in our rural districts is not a general increase of clergy, but of ministrations; and especially of *suitable places* where the clergy may exercise their ministry for the good of those who are debarred by

distance from attendance at their parish church. It is not a sub-division of parishes, but a multiplication of means of grace within each parish, that is wanted; a fact that was well brought out in the "Representation" of the Lower House of Convocation in 1859.

It is not to be concealed, however, that the great want of all is zeal, fidelity, perseverance, and love in the parish priest himself. Where these are, it is not likely there will be any insuperable difficulty in raising the 400*l.* requisite to build a Mission-House; or the 50*l.*, or 100*l.*, as the case may be, for adapting existing buildings to be rented for the purpose. Wherever a Mission-House has as yet been built the benefits have proved rather greater than less than had been anticipated. We may therefore congratulate the National Church on the success of the movement, so far as it has already gone: but we may do much more than this; we may aid, each in our measure and degree, in promoting the extension of this new and useful agency. And when the increase of Mission-Houses comes to be reckoned by hundreds instead of by tens, we may confidently anticipate the time when the hamlets and villages, which are ever feeding the ever-growing towns of England, will send up, more than they have done hitherto, trained, and educated, and intelligent members of the Church to fill the Churches with worshippers, and the Sunday Schools with teachers, and the parishes with attached sons and daughters of the Church of England.

Annual Exhibition of the Royal Academy.

WE were glad to find that the prestige of the Annual Exhibition of the works of our native artists in the rooms of the Royal Academy had not been dulled this season by the dangerous rivalry it had to contend with. Vast galleries had sprung up at Brompton, with all the rapidity, and a good deal of the hideousness of fungous growth, within whose ugly walls, like pearls in the rugged oyster, an array of master works, selected among the productions of every country that can boast a school of painting, had been assembled, forming a gallery of modern art such as neither this nor any other country has ever before seen collected under a single roof. In this vast aggregation of the best products of modern painting, the chief glories of the English school itself, from Hogarth to Turner, of course find their fitting place; and yet it is pleasant to find, although thousands are daily gazing at those far-spreading walls clothed with the priceless treasures of a whole century of art, that the familiar steps beneath poor Willis's well-abused portico in Trafalgar-square have been as crowded as in former summers,—as bright and busy as ever with the rustle and bustle of gay-hued silk and floating muslin. This is as it should be; and we hope that the apparent number of the crowds that have daily thronged the rooms during the past months are not deceptive, and that no deficiency of the inflow of shillings has occurred; for cash forms almost as much the sinew of academies as of war.

On entering the rooms of the Royal Academy this season we find that the flash of light and colour that met the eye on entering the first room had lost none of its old charm. The bright scale of colour which distinguishes the English schools rarely fails to captivate the eye at a first glance. So that, even after a visit to the vast galleries of Brompton, (where the colouring of the French school is pitched in a lower key, and where most of the specimens of the English school have undergone more or less of the sobering down of time,) the effect of the new works in Trafalgar-square produces a most agreeable impression. The colours bright and fresh, and, as one may say, dewy, from the so recently busy pallet, have a charm of their own, to which it has long been a pleasure to succumb in the

sunny days of early summer. Still, the gaps caused by the absence of works from the pencil of Sir Edwin Landseer cannot be satisfactorily filled. Maclise, too, is unrepresented, but then his great fresco in the House of Lords is a sufficient excuse. Mr. Frith's great work of the season is exhibiting privately in the Haymarket,—this is vexatious. And then there is not a single work by Mr. Holman Hunt, which will be felt as a great loss by the numerous admirers of the great leader of the Pre-Raphaelite school.

Mr. Millais' pictures do not supply the place of Mr. Hunt's works, nor, indeed, do the styles of the two Pre-Raphaelite artists agree with each other; in fact the works of Mr. Millais may be considered as works of an entirely distinct class. *The Ransom* is the most elaborate work he exhibits this year. We find in it, once more, much of that firm and careful painting which first created his reputation, and which such loose and imperfectly executed works as the *Vale of Rest* went far to destroy. The present picture, however, with much beauty of colour, and an appreciation of "texture" in the various details, which it would be difficult to surpass, has yet, in a glaring degree, special defects peculiar to the artist which disfigure many of his finest works; we allude more especially to a certain "ugliness" in the faces and limbs of the young figures, and to an extreme general flatness, which, in the present instance, makes the principal figures seem part of the tapestry intended to form their background, but to which they adhere, as with a kind of compression, that calls to mind those posies of flowers, pressed flat under a glass, which children delight to make when bluebells and cowslips are plentiful in the spring fields. The other large picture by this artist, *Trust me*, is in some respects a preferable work, but is yet far from satisfying the expectations raised by the early works of this artist. An English squire of the last generation, equipped for the hunting field, and his rather plain daughter (all Mr. Millais' ladies are plain), are the only figures. The father holds the leathern letter-bag about to be dispatched across country to the post; the girl wishes to put in a letter without showing the address, saying, in answer to her father's remonstrance, "Trust me." Such appears to be the story; but the figures are both of them of such thoroughly uninteresting aspect, that one does not care a rush for the story, nor whether the young lady be trusted or not. Her brown silk is, however, a marvellous piece of painting, and whether executed through the medium of a photograph, or with the aid of a lay-figure matters little; the work is excellent. Mr. Millais' smaller picture, illustrating the parable of the woman seeking for a piece of money, with its wonderful candle-light effects, and powerful treatment of the general chiaro-scuro, is in every way commendable, and promises the successful development of a style hitherto untouched by this gifted artist.

The landscapes of the Linnells, father and sons, are, as usual, very remarkable works. *Carrying Wheat*, by Mr. Linnell, sen., is a work of the highest class. The rain-foretelling rays of white light shooting upward from where the sun has just sunk behind the lowest bank of evening cloud, the hurry and bustle of the figures in the rich but dusk tone of the foreground, doing all they know around the great waggons, in order to house the wheat before the coming storm, are, with a number of other details, wonderfully wrought out. So is also *The Gleaners' Return*, by one of the younger Linnells, which exhibits a totally opposite effect of sunset. The sky is all aglow with orange and crimson in the western horizon, while in the foreground the blue twilight is rapidly deepening into night, as the line of figures straggle homeward. It is fully equal if not superior to the first-named picture. There is, indeed, no lack of pictures in the present display well worth describing in detail did space allow, from Mr. Wells' clever portrait (No. 4) in the east-room, to Mr. Lee's striking view of *The Rock of Gibraltar* (No. 667) in the north-room; but our space limits us to a very brief summary of our impressions during the past two months, the general result of which is, that the present display, with all drawbacks, is fully up to the average. Mr. Frost's Nymphs in his *Panope*,

are, however, merely a group of well-arranged plaster-casts, yet tinted with a skill that might furnish hints for the improvement of Mr. Gibson's coloured statuary at the International Exhibition. Mr. Ansdell's *Excelsior* appeared to us over melo-dramatic, and, moreover, not original. We seemed to recognize those capitably painted giant-dogs as old acquaintances. Sir Edwin Landseer's *Alpine Mastiffs*, engraved by J. Landseer, are vividly brought to mind, to say nothing of the famous French picture *Les Chiens de S. Bernard*, the engravings of which have gone the round of the world. Mr. O'Neil, in his *Mary Stuart's Farewell to France*, is masterly, both in grouping and colouring; but he has been looking at works of the French school too much, and there are turns of the head (*airs de tête*) with many other characteristics, which recall, rather too vividly Paul Delaroche, Deveria, and other French masters. Creswick is very great this year; he has put out all his old strength, with new powers superadded. *The Halfway House*, an old begabed road-side inn, with all its naturally associated features, is a noble picture, one which would certainly have made Ruysdael, or Both, or Hobbima, or Teniers, open wide eyes, had they unexpectedly seen it in a Flemish exhibition of their day. Mr. Horsley, too, makes great advances. His *Checkmate, Next Move*, treads closely upon the heels of the very finest works of Leslie. The elderly couple in the foreground, with a real chess-board and real chess-men, and the young pair in the oak-seat of the old bay window, playing the same game entirely without such material aid, are equally excellent—the painter's pencil has played both games with the same point and success.

Laborare est Orare, is the title of a large and very pleasing picture by Mr. Herbert. The monks of S. Bernard's Abbey, Leicestershire, are gathering in the harvest of 1861. The work is full of the calm and sweet repose attributed to monastic life. The Roman Catholic interest is, in short, enlisting the powerful aid of painting, architecture, and sculpture in the bold attempt to reinstate ideas and things of the past. The Catholic Church of England must not trust overmuch to the superiority of its cause, or impressions may be produced which it will be no easy task to obliterate. Mr. Roberts' grand series of pictures, exhibiting the architecture of London from the banks of the Thames, will form a truly national-gallery of art in itself. But the grand and facile pencil of the great master of pictorial architecture is occasionally careless. In No. 489, the proportions of the Blackfriars-bridge are far too small for those of S. Paul's, which is of truly Titanic size when its distance from the bridge is considered with reference to the ordinary laws of perspective. If the picture should happen to be preserved in some antipodean museum, long after the decay of our great metropolis, Australian antiquarians will be justified in estimating the height of our S. Paul's, judging from the ancient painting in their possession, as having been somewhere about five-thousand feet above the apex of the hill anciently known as that of Ludgate. Mr. F. R. Pickersgill exhibits only a single picture, *The Return of the Crusader*, an excellent work, and less mannered than usual; the old Italian masters have, we were glad to find, been partially forgotten. Mr. Philip, the English Murillo, gives us several of his sunny Spanish pictures, some of which will well sustain his repute; but he has no great leading work. *The Invention of the Combing-machine*, by Mr. Elmore, is masterly in its technical treatment, but was not altogether a well-chosen subject for the pencil: a feuilletonist might have handled it more effectively than a painter. Mr. Poole's fine picture *The Ordeal by Water*, though remarkable for some of the best features of this master, breadth of treatment, and slashing execution, is yet not equal to his *Poet's Dream*, now in the Exhibition at Brompton; a masterpiece of imaginative painting. Mr. Sidney Cooper has over-elaborated his works this year; his telling touch has been too much smoothed down by high finish. Mr. E. W. Cook sends breezy subjects from the shores of the Mediterranean. Mr. Faed and Mr. Paton have a charming picture each; while Mr. Hannah is fast rising to a very high position in his art. His *Sisters of Charity* are charming.

The portraiture of the year is not remarkable; but Mr. Grant's fine quiet picture of his Brother, and Mr. Richmond's *Dean of Wells*, in a tone and style all his own, are capital. The miniature-room is becoming more and more vacant. The photographic *carte de visite* has driven the Thorburns and Richmonds and Wellses from the narrow limits of the ivory to the broader domain of canvas. Photography has taken possession of the drawing-room table and of the waistcoat pocket; but the walls of the dining-room and the gallery remain as yet uninvaded by the productions of the heliograph. The sculpture-rooms have, it would seem, been made larger to hold less; there are, however, some good busts, and one or two other things well worth looking at.

Gipsies.



THE parochial system of England is admitted by its stanchest and most enthusiastic admirers not to be even theoretically perfect. Its boasted aim is, to bring the Church and the Gospel home to every man's door. Practically it does not cover the ground of this definition. The natural increase alone of town populations quite outstrips existing ecclesiastical institutions, and the capabilities of ancient endowments. New centres of labour and trade are continually arising, and create new centres of population. Thus the relative number of *parishioners*, i.e. of those entitled to a share in the spiritual resources of a certain territorial limit, is continually shifting, while the resources, which originated in ancient times, under a totally different condition of circumstances, commonly remain the same. Then, new employments of various descriptions, which draw off people into inaccessible situations of incessant labour, are also continually arising, and practically excommunicate large masses. Railway men, navvies, drivers of hackney carriages, such as London cabmen, are familiar instances of this latter class; as the mining and manufacturing populations are of the former. Soldiers, sailors, policemen, bargemen on canals, boatmen in harbours and on rivers, fishermen on the coast, the migratory and chance sojourners of sea-port towns, number millions of British citizens and denizens without any recognized intimate relationship of pastor and flock—sheep without a shepherd—unreached by the parochial system. Then, again, there are vast crowds of people continually on the tramp, alone, in gangs, and in families; Arabs scouring the country from town to town, without home or settled neighbourhood, subsisting altogether on mendicancy and imposture, or pilfering and cadging, or peddling and petty handicraft. No one who has not studied constabulary reports and statistics, or has not made a personal inspection of the vagrant wards in union workhouses, or the low lodging-houses of country towns, can form any just idea of the extent of our English vagabondism, and how the parochial equilibrium is thereby necessarily deranged.

But there is one class of regular tramps and extra-parishioners so entirely *sui generis* as to deserve a more particular consideration. What is the relation of English gipsies to our ecclesiastical system? Do they fall within or without the system? What is their claim upon our existing pastoral institutions? On whom lie the obligation and responsibility of their spiritual tutelage and nurture? They have, of course, a direct and immediate claim on the ministrations of the National Church. But through what channel or agency ought her ministrations properly to reach them? In short, is it any person's business to look after and care for the religious condition of their poor souls? This is a line of inquiry, we apprehend, on which the large majority of our readers have never thought of questioning themselves or others, and a satisfactory reply to which they would have a difficulty in finding.

In truth, how almost none of us have knowledge of

any kind about the gipsies! They occupy the place in our thoughts of mysterious and romantic associations. Our recollections of them call up poetical images of green lanes, wild commons, shady woods; the

"Column of slow-rising smoke."
 "A kettle, slung
 Between two poles, upon a stick transverse."
 "A tawny skin,
 The vellum of the pedigree they claim."
 "The mirthful note and dance,
 With music of the bladder and the bag,"

of Cowper's *Task*; or the picturesque descriptions of *Bracebridge Hall*; or James' novel; or Borrow's *Spanish Reminiscences*. Or we ourselves have pleasant memories of that genial summer day at Norwood, or Hampstead-heath, or Epping-forest, and the black-eyed, black-haired fortune-teller,

"In the days when we went gipsying, a long time ago."

Or, if our vacation rambles have carried us so far South as to the noble Pont du Gard, we may have witnessed, crouched in the shadows of that beautiful fragment of the Roman aqueduct, precisely the same squalid encampment, and gaunt swarthy-limbed group we might any day alight upon on some roadside sward of Hertfordshire or Surrey, identity of dialect proving the affinity; and have so, perhaps, acquired a confused doubt whether Bohemia or Egypt were the original fatherland of these mysterious wanderers. The latter fallacy, derived from the name Gipsy, seems to have prevailed at the time of the Oxford Newdegate of 1837. But the author, an honoured Professor of that University, could now probably throw stronger and more authentic light upon the subject. In his youthful prize poem he conjectures, that—

"— in yonder chief of tattered vest
 Glows the same blood that warmed a Pharaoh's breast,
 And in the fiery eye, the haughty mien,
 The tawny hue of yonder gipsy Queen,
 Still dwells the light of Cleopatra's charms,
 The winning grace that roused the world to arms.
 Lo, Mizraim's kingcraft, of its glory reft,
 Is shrunk to petty deeds of midnight theft!
 Lo, Egypt's wisdom only lives to pry
 Through the dark arts of paltry palmistry!"

We believe that this theory has long since been exploded. Ethnologists now trace the language, the physical lineaments, the traditional habits of the gipsies, to the regions of High Asia, where irregular castes of the aboriginal population are still nomades, encamping in ~~low~~ woollen tents, and practising the hereditary art of tinkers. Their deportation into Europe is attributed to an event no less distinguished in mediæval history than the Indian crusades of Timour. At the beginning of the fifteenth century they "knocked at the gates of awe-struck Christendom," evidently as fugitives from the persecution and tyranny of the sword. Their appearance in these islands must have been as sudden and unaccounted for as those "famous waters" of which Camden, quoting Walter of Hemingburgh and William of Newborough, tells us that they "spring from the earth at several sources," and from unknown springs, and are commonly called Vipseys, or Gipseys, in the North country. Hence, it is a plausible conjecture, the identity of name.

Is it not a thing almost incredible that they have now for centuries been naturalized in England without (so far as we are acquainted) any extensive systematic attempt having ever once been made, on the part of the National Church, to convert them from their hereditary heathenism and ungodliness? Partial efforts, at intervals, of a private nature, and on a very limited scale, have resulted in a mere modicum of success. We are informed, on the authority of one who has made inquiry into their habits and traditions his study for many years, that their number in England at this time must be between 18,000 and 20,000, and of these about 2,000 perhaps, at most, make any profession of Christianity. The rest are said to be singularly destitute of even natural religion, and are certainly

without any definite formulary or creed. Now, at a time when our universities are clubbing together to send missions to the heathen beyond British territory, and individuals are founding Bishops' sees, and expedients, good, bad, and indifferent, are being devised every day to supplement our parochial system in the several deficiencies indicated at the opening of this article, we do hope that philanthropy and enthusiasm will before long turn our zeal in the direction of these poor heathen gipsies. A soul is a soul anywhere, and not more valuable in Central Africa or Melanesia than when perishing close before the eyes of our National Church. These other works of charity most unquestionably ought to be done, but not so as to leave this immediate and pressing duty undone. Our conduct in regard to this and some other proximate responsibilities almost belies the sentiment of the elder Wilberforce, in his *Practical Christianity*, when pleading for foreign missions, that we are more affected by the prick of a pin and the consequent scream in the next room, than on hearing of whole villages on the continent carried off by earthquake, or by some barbarous massacre in China. It is not many weeks since that public interest was a good deal excited by the account of the death and burial of a young gipsy girl, Lepronia Lee, which went the round of the newspapers. We wish we had grounds for hoping that the opportunity was followed up, and did not evaporate in mere sentiment. It is time that the Lees, the Lovels, the Stanleys, and the other families of the tribe, whose names come across us sometimes, should cease to be the same sort of poetical and impersonal abstractions as Meg Merrilees, or Bamfylde Moore Carew. Perhaps no object of what is called a Home Mission has been so thoroughly overlooked by our Church authorities and societies as this; not even those who, in one sense, are our forefathers in the true faith, God's ancient people resident among us, and whom we seem almost content to leave in their spiritual alienation, impeded, rather than not, by the miserable machinery which alone has been invented to attempt their conversion.

We commend the whole subject to the Additional Curates' Society, within whose special province it seems to fall, and to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which might well devote some of its abundant funds in this direction. We commend it, also, to the Convocations of the two Provinces, which will find no part of their proper work at least more popular and acceptable than devising some sufficient *locus penitentiae* for plain duties such as this, hitherto neglected by the Church of the country; and the remedy of which neglect, we will add, would be easy and inexpensive.

Innkeepers.



WE have for a long time thought that innkeepers and publicans are a very much misunderstood and misjudged class of people. They are not uncommonly even shunned by serious persons, as if, from the very nature of their calling, almost necessarily irreligious and ungodly men. For the same reason too, we suppose it is that, compared with other parishioners, they are seldom visited by their own clergymen at home; and being too often kept away from a place of public worship by incessant occupations, they have less frequent opportunities than most others of learning their Christian duties, or, so far as regards a proper observance of the one great day in seven, which is an Englishman's summary of religion, of performing them; yet, notwithstanding the manifest temptations and disadvantages which undoubtedly beset their worldly calling, we would maintain against the common prejudice on the subject to which we have alluded, that very few positions in life afford so many or better opportunities of serving God faithfully, and exercising active charity towards our fellow-Christians, by preventing evil with good influence and advice, than theirs does. We own, indeed, that we share with the holy

and large-hearted bishop of Geneva, S. Francis de Sales, who lived nearly three hundred years ago, a feeling almost of admiration and reverence for the office of an innkeeper, though we must confess, with him, that its duties are not so often well fulfilled as they ought to be. And in endeavouring to explain, as follows, our own thoughts upon the subject, we shall borrow a good deal from a little French work which we were lately reading, containing some of his choice sayings on this and other matters.

He used to say, for example, that he knew of no state of life in which there were more ways of serving God in one's neighbour, and of doing works worthy of heaven, because it is a business which has for its object the practice of the several works of mercy, although those who do them are paid for their work, just the same as physicians also are. He pointed out that innkeepers give up their own rest to procure the rest of others, that they are only as servants in their own houses, that they have to endure the caprices, the insolence, the murmurs, and the passions of a multitude of persons of various tempers; that they are obliged to submit to contempt and insult, to watch while others sleep, often to give up their own bed to strangers, to be as closely fastened to their own houses as statues to their niches, to have no hour to themselves either by night or by day, to be continually on foot, in the midst of noise and bustle, and yet with the impossibility of pleasing everybody, let them wish it ever so much.

Certainly, there is thus set before them every day the fairest possible field for the exercise of the chiefest Christian graces, patience, humility, and love. And we can readily believe that if this saint, who had such sweet and gentle manners, had himself exercised such a business, he would have carried it out to great perfection. Indeed, he sometimes remarked that the very duties which are enjoined upon bishops are especially applicable to Christian innkeepers, viz. to be vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, not given to wine, no striker, not guilty of filthy lucre, but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; that the keepers of our inns and public houses ought to make a point of trying to practise conduct like this, and to regard their calling with due honour according to the dignity thereof, as a means of exercising Christian "hospitality" towards Christian guests; that they should sanctify its duties by associating them with that Inn at Bethlehem in which there was "no room" once found for a blessed Babe and a poor Virgin Mother on a cold Christmas morning; or with that other, where a wounded half dead sufferer was lodged by a good Samaritan, with the promise that when he came again, he would amply repay all charitable charges; and therefore they should always open their heart wide in "entertaining strangers," lest there might be One, greater than an angel, coming unawares in some guise or other, and knocking at it, but through moroseness and inhospitality might once more find "no room."

Every profession, indeed, may be entered upon in a religious spirit, and made an opportunity of serving God and of doing good to our fellow-men; but some more than others, and perhaps none more than this. We have noticed, however, that those which are especially capable of a holy and religious use, such as a soldier's, for example, or a medical man's, are at the same time more than others also subject to certain temptations leading to the neglect of God and religion; and this is true of an innkeeper's and publican's especially, if followed only for its worldly and selfish ends. Still the office for its own sake is worthy of respect, and the frequent abuse of it may in many instances be in no small measure owing to the prejudice of serious and religious people to which we have adverted. An experienced parish priest once told us that he always made a point of paying particular attention to the inns and public-houses under his pastoral charge whether in town or country; that more often than not he found the landlords themselves good fellows at the bottom, capable of enlistment in the Church's service, that they made capital churchwardens, and that he partly "worked" at the worst of his parishioners through them. We commend the thought to the attention of our clerical readers; the example may be

worthy of imitation. There are black sheep of course which are the scandal of every profession; but not more in this, we believe, than in any other. On one occasion, when light conversation was going on after a meal, innkeepers came upon the *tapis*, and as every one freely expressed his opinion of them, one said that inns were veritable robbers' caves, and that most innkeepers were but tolerated thieves. This discourse displeased the good bishop, as might be seen by the change of his countenance, but as the place and time were not suitable for grave reproof, he contented himself with an indirect remonstrance by relating the following capital story:—

"A Spanish pilgrim, whose purse was not very heavy, arrived at an inn where, after having been treated ill enough, they charged him so dearly for the little he had had, that he called heaven and earth to witness the wrong that was done him. Nevertheless, he was compelled to pay all that was asked from him, because he was the weaker party. He went out of the inn in great anger, and having remarked that there was another inn opposite, and that a crucifix stood in the midst of the space between the two, he cried out, 'Verily, this place is a Calvary where our Lord is crucified between two thieves!' The master of the inn in which he had not lodged happened to be then standing at his door. He came forward and asked the pilgrim what wrong he had done him to deserve so injurious a title. The pilgrim replied, without being disconcerted, 'Hold your peace, hold your peace, you shall be the good thief.'"

After having told this story, the saintly bishop went on to apply it by saying that this pilgrim had made him an ingenious repartee, which satisfied the man to whom he spoke; but, however, that we ought carefully to avoid blaming indiscriminately and generally any nation or any profession whatsoever, because, though no particular person may be named, yet the members of that country and profession feel themselves involved in the censure and are naturally aggrieved. We will here leave our readers to apply the moral to themselves.

Dilapidations.



WO Bills have been of late introduced into the House of Lords on the subject of Ecclesiastical Dilapidations. The one, in 1861, by the Bishop of London. A second, in this session, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Of the lay peers, Lord Duncannon seems to have taken the strongest interest in these attempts at legislation, by continuously urging the prelates to attend to so important a matter. We may dismiss the first Bill without further remark than that it was so much encumbered with machinery, and general taxation of the clergy, as to be inadmissible; and appeared not to deal with episcopal and prebendal houses in the same manner as with the parsonages of the clergy. In respect of episcopal houses this is a capital fault of Bill No. 2 also. The second Bill alone requires present attention.

The law as it has hitherto stood is, beyond doubt, most uncertain and burthensome. On the decease of an incumbent his successor claims a sum adequate to put the glebe premises, &c. in full repair. There is no generally received interpretation of the meaning of full repair. Two valuers are usually appointed, one on each side. These often differ most widely, having no common rule of action. Then, perhaps, there is an umpire. Hence a multiplication of expense, even if there shall be no question at law. In the meantime the heir or assign of the deceased is often in a very unprovided state as to money. Most frequently it is a widow, and she frequently with a dependent family, little able to pay any heavy demand, and generally unequal to contest one. Again, it happens not very rarely that the deceased incumbent leaves really no assets at all, in which case the whole costs of repair must fall on the successor. And should that successor be suddenly cut off by death,

his assigns are subject to the demand, although such deficiencies of repair were not incurred by his neglect. There is another difficulty where an appointment does not take place pretty close on a vacancy. A few months of non-habitation often subject a building to many injuries and accidents; and the nominal custody by churchwardens, often residing far from a parsonage, is seldom of much service. There is no lapse by time to the presentations by the Crown, and these intermediate dilapidations may fall most unfairly on the assigns of the deceased. The late Lord Eldon often left his patronage, especially of small benefices, unexercised for nearly two years. This was not from dilatory habits, but the desire, as he is known to have expressed it, that certain back-revenues, which would be collected by the wardens, should accrue to his presentee, to assist him in commencing residence. It was a mistake, inefficacious often as to the intent, and injurious in many ways, while it sadly augmented dilapidation difficulties. It is not likely to occur again to any extent, but may act unfavourably at times in degree, and be held as one cause why improved law is required.

Again, it is really almost inconceivable how great the differences are in these *post-mortem* valuations. A widow can oftentimes form no possible conjecture whether a claim against her may amount to forty or four hundred pounds. Surveyors employed are often country-town builders, who never were called to such special duty before. One of these will declare a new roof to be necessary, while another will deem that the present one will keep out the weather a good quarter of a century at the cost of some new oak laths and a few hundred tiles. Some will adjudge that there is a general dry-rot throughout a house, while his opponent decides that the dripping from some ill-guttered roof has alone rotted the ends of some sleepers of a floor, which may be easily replaced. In proof of this there is an instance where dilapidations were assessed at 250*l.* The money was paid to the in-coming rector, but he held the benefice for a very short time and did not lay it out. His successor demanded a new valuation, and the new surveyor, who was ignorant of the previous valuation, placed the sum of 72*l.* only as necessary for repairs. So much had these premises improved by neglect. Indeed, there is no real compulsion at present upon any incumbent to expend the money he has received in any given number of years.

It is undeniable that such a state of things demands some adjustment. It is also plain that a very small part of such anomalies can be done away with, unless repairs are either done or provided for *durante vitâ* of an existing incumbent.

The Archbishop's Bill is founded on this principle. There are to be regularly surveyors elected by certain clerical officials for each diocese, perhaps for each archdeaconry would be better. They are to sign declarations as to certain rules of conduct. They can have no interest whatever in any works to be executed. But the act itself is not to affect any existing incumbents, unless at their own request; a provision introduced, probably, because from want of habit many persons object to that which they conceive an intrusion—a compulsory inspection of their premises. To this exception we should greatly demur, were it not that we believe a very large majority will embrace the opportunities afforded by such inspection to place their pecuniary affairs in a more assured and arranged state for their families. They have the permissive use of all the purposes of the Bill. The surveyor will report on ordinary and extraordinary repairs required. The ordinary to be executed by the incumbent: the extraordinary (those not arising from neglect) by charge on the benefice, and money borrowed from the bounty fund, much as under Gilbert's Act for building glebe-houses.

The surveyor will state the necessary repairs, and specify a time for the execution, but there is admission of a referee if there is any dispute. The cost of inspection as to ordinary repairs to be borne by the incumbent; as to extraordinary ones, by charge on the benefice. A certificate of due execution by the surveyor clears all liability

for repairs for five years (seven or ten years would be preferable, as frequent inspections are inconvenient), but the incumbent must insure from fire and flood, &c. Such are the more general provisions of the Archbishop's Bill, which certainly meets most of the difficulties of the existing law. There should be some option between repairing and depositing the valuation-money of such repairs, in one or more sums. And there are certain occasions when the incumbent must have the choice of postponing surveyor's visit, or execution of works, such as age, household sickness, impossibility of residence during repair, &c. But all this may, by the present Bill, be obtained from the bishop on cause shown.

If a rule for tenantable repair cannot be placed exactly before a surveyor, it would seem reasonable that that which would be held as such by him for any other house for a term of seven, or perhaps fourteen, years might be a fair guide for his valuation. The question between fixed salaries for surveyors, or, as in the Bill, payment by those who require their services, might be settled at their election. The last seems preferable, as regular yearly demands savour of a regular taxation.

This leads to another remark on the matter of expense. The clergy generally are somewhat sore on the subject of registration and some other fees; nor are they so without good reason. Diocesan registrars in most cases act by deputy. They enjoy certain sinecure incomes, as they may fairly be termed, and employ, at a salary, some official about a cathedral to perform their duties for them. Hence it is that the largest proportion of them have been near relatives or dependants of existing or deceased prelates, as, indeed, their names so often testify. It is obvious that the returns which would be sufficient to remunerate the deputy would provide for the real expenses of the office. But the charges of that office produce indeed a heavy multiple of any such sum. The clergy feel this, and often express it. It has been pressed upon them also very much by registration and other unnecessary charges at consecrations. These have been remedied, but partially only, and in some dioceses: in others not at all. The defence of the officials has been weak. It has been urged that diminished charges are virtually an income-tax on their office. Whereas within a quarter of a century there were scarcely any church-consecrations at all, so that the very numerous ones celebrated of late years have, at *any* fee, been a sure augmentation to their revenue. The common expression used is—"why so much machinery?" Some registration will no doubt be necessary as documentary evidence as to facts, but after restraining that as much as possible, let there be a certain definite small fee established for each act of registration, and generally circulated, as well as the notice by whom it is payable, whether by incumbent or surveyor, or whatever other person. In this there should be no reference whatever to the accustomed charges for other acts in the same registry. That which will pay a clerk for the trouble should be the measure of the expense.

It is impossible to keep the dilapidation question altogether distinct from that of the pecuniary difficulties of too many of the clergy, arising from insufficient revenues on their benefices. They must often act upon each other. This leads to the question whether inadvertently, and no doubt with the best intentions, both legislators and bishops have not pushed the erection of parsonage-houses, and, indeed, the celebration of Divine service twice on the Sunday, somewhat too far in many instances. There is no question but that wherever the endowments in any parish, however small the population, are sufficient for the support of an educated man in a respectable although humble style, the parishioners have a just claim to a resident incumbent in a glebe-house, and the full double services of the Church regularly performed. But where such endowments are obviously insufficient for such an end, and where the population is also very limited, (let us suppose under two or three hundred persons,) where is the justice or wisdom of such a requirement? No possible amount of Church revenue can supply an income for an educated man for every three hundred persons.

Besides, a small population in the country and a small area are usually coincident; and if there should be no parsonage and no resident pastor, while the duties are performed by one who has partial duties elsewhere, the parishioner will be often far nearer to his pastor in the neighbouring parish, than many an inhabitant of an extensive parish, residing in one of its out-hamlets, is to his own parochial and resident minister. These remarks are caused by personal observation of many small incomes combined with very small populations. Houses have been built in them the sustentation of which is very onerous, and the future dilapidations on which may be very grievous, and hence a necessary extension has taken place in the numbers of the poor clergy, for whom not much external aid can be expected, when the populous districts of towns have such heavier claims on our attention. We cannot easily recall what has been done in these cases, as far as houses are concerned, but we may be cautious how we extend the evil both as bearing on all dilapidation enactments, and the poverty of too many of the clergy. How many, too, of the more liberally endowed incumbents with numerous parishioners would be able to afford themselves the aid of an assistant-curate for part of their duties, if the expense incident on such appointment was lightened by certain limited duties to be performed by their curate within a short distance in other small peopled parishes, where a single Sunday service, performed alternately on mornings and afternoons or evenings, would suffice.

As an appurtenance to dilapidations a certain rule must be established as to fixtures of freehold, that is, those which cannot be charged to a successor, and those saleable to him or others. The Bill does not notice this, any more than a definition of repairs, but in this there would be no difficulty in naming certain articles, and mode of fixture, making them more or less removable. There have been unpleasant disagreements, and, indeed, law-suits, from this cause, which may now be easily extinguished.

The Bicentenary.



THE Liberation Society made a great blunder when it let slip that it looked upon the Abolition of Church-rate only as a step towards the separation of Church and State. Your average Englishman was just getting so tired of the worry, that he was willing to give up Church-rate for the sake of peace and quietness. But as soon as he was told that it was a question, not of crotchety consciences, nor even of unwilling pockets, but of the maintenance of "the Establishment," Mr. Miall's chance was gone.

We believe the Society has made a blunder equally great in directing public attention to the Nonconformist secession of 1662. Your average Englishman is really very little acquainted with the political, and still less with the ecclesiastical, history of his own nation; and the difficulty is how to insense him. He will not read anything of the sort which is longer than a magazine article, or a pamphlet; and even that must be light and piquant, or he cannot pull through it. The very thing we wanted, in the present condition of political and ecclesiastical questions, was to induce people to study the history of the Great Rebellion; but though it would not have been easy to persuade a dozen men in the kingdom to sit down and study history, what we could not do the Liberation Society has unintentionally done for us. By proposing a commemoration of the closing scene of that instructive portion of our national and ecclesiastical annals, it has attracted public curiosity to the whole subject. The public curiosity is being gradually satisfied, after its own fashion, by newspaper articles, pamphlets, lectures, &c. The present generation of Englishmen are becoming pretty familiar with the great political and religious experiments which our forefathers made two hundred years ago; and we need nothing more to ensure their attach-

ment to our existing constitution in Church and State. It is a little curious, by the way, that just when the Church had ceased to commemorate *Charles, King and Martyr*, and to celebrate the 29th of May as a Church festival, the Liberation Society should have come forward to confer the doubtful honour of sectarian canonization upon the 2000 *Confessors*, and should proclaim a festival for the celebration of Nonconformity. But thus it is, when we cease to keep truth in mind, falsehood steps at once into its place. We do not mean to say that the Liberation Society had an eye to the coincidence. We believe that they had not very carefully considered either the antecedents or the consequences of their Bicentenary Commemoration. We are more inclined to believe the honest truth to be, that the whole thing was done a little hurriedly, and without much thought. The politico-religious party, of whom Mr. Miall is the hero, had been losing ground lately. They were very much in want of some pretext for rallying their adherents, and stirring up the people. It occurred to somebody that the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662, and this was 1862; and the happy thought flashed across his mind of a Bicentenary Commemoration. What a capital text for a renewed agitation! and then what telling "cries" to go to the country with!—"Black Bartholomew!" with all its associations of Protestant massacre clinging vaguely about it. *Two Thousand Confessors of Nonconformity!* Martyrs of the persecuting spirit of the Church! Heroes of civil and religious liberty! We have no doubt it seemed a brilliant idea when it was suggested at a "Liberation" conclave, and was eagerly snatched at. See how many birds this trap will catch! First, there are the religious Dissenters. They had been looking very coldly lately at the political clique which needed them as tools; but they would be sure to rally round the old Nonconformist Divines. The Low Church and the High Church had been laying aside prejudices, drawing closer together, and working energetically for the common cause. This revival of the old Puritan secession would sow fresh discord between them. There is a party seeking an alteration of the Liturgy; and another, a relaxation of clerical subscriptions; and many, of all parties, are craving for union. The Bicentenary Commemoration would hold out points of affinity to them all. The prospect really did look very hopeful; but everything has turned out just the opposite of their hopes. The religious Dissenters look very coldly on the new agitation. A glance at the history of the Great Rebellion may perhaps have reminded them how, in those days, the politico-religious party, which is very accurately represented now by the Liberation Society, made tools of the parliamentary Puritan party, of which the religious dissenters may be considered the modern representatives. They decline to accept Mr. Miall's lead. Some of their leading teachers have publicly declared against it. Even Mr. Spurgeon repudiates it. And the *Morning Advertiser* gives a long article against it in which are a few gems worth culling:—"The Dissenters of the Liberation Society would be the greatest tyrants in Christendom over men's consciences, if they possessed the necessary civil power. . . There is no denying the fact that Dissent is rapidly declining in England. And we verily believe that this Bicentenary movement was all that was wanting to precipitate its dissolution."

The Society took for granted that the "Evangelical" clergy would join them in doing this honour to the "Nonconformist Divines." It seems to have had a sort of expectation that, if properly worked, they might even be led to imitate their illustrious example. At least, they would be got to loggerheads with their High Church brethren; and that would be no small advantage to the assailants of the "Establishment." But it has not answered. The Evangelical clergy are simply indignant at the way in which their dissenting brethren are treating them. And just as the Romish aggression drove back a number of people whose sympathies were leading them out of the sober limits of the Church of England in that direction, so this Bicentenary seems very likely to repel a number of

people whose sympathies have strayed out of bounds in the other direction ; and the Church will be helped thereby to union for the great work of completing and extending her organization, recovering the people to her fold, and carrying forth the standard of her Lord among the heathen nations of the world, which are being so wonderfully opened up to her evangelical enterprise.

It would seem, then, that this move of the Liberation Society politicians tends only to scatter discord among earnest dissenters, and to draw the clergy into compacter union. What success have the clap-trap "cries" of the new agitation met with among the multitude? Well, even here it has been signally unsuccessful. The Society's agents have not been permitted to confine attention to the concluding act of the great drama of the Rebellion, and to put their own interpretation upon it. Church people have come forward to say, we were willing to let by-gones be by-gones ; but if those old troubles are to be brought to light, let us have the whole story, and let it be fairly told. This appeal to the English sense of fairness is proving eminently successful. The people's curiosity is excited, and they are willing to hear both sides. It is our own fault now if we do not make the people of England so thoroughly acquainted with the leading points of the history as will fortify them against the democratic agitators and religious demagogues, and attach them more firmly than ever to our existing constitution in Church and State.

Already a good deal has been done by newspaper articles, by pamphlets, and by Mr. Bardsley's capital popular lectures. As the 24th of August approaches, no doubt the discussion will become more general, and will wax warmer ; and we will take leave to suggest a few of the salient points which it seems to us should be specially kept in view by those who take a part in the discussion on the side of the Church.

Let the whole history be fairly sketched. In its simple facts lies the most complete and overwhelming reply to the moral which the Liberation Society desires to draw from its Bicentenary of "Black Bartholomew." But there are certain points to be made emphatic in order to produce a strong and permanent impression upon an ordinary popular audience.

The first point is the ejection and persecution of the Bishops, Dignitaries, and Clergy of the Church, the Heads, Fellows, and Scholars of the Universities, and the Masters of Schools, to the number of 8000 or thereabouts, during the early part of the Rebellion. The Dissenters call the secession of the Nonconformists an act of cruel persecution ; let it be shown what a religious persecution in those days really was. Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy* will afford an abundance of interesting cases ; and we are glad to see that an abstract of that rather rare old book is just published. We are quite sure that all this will be perfectly new to many, who will be very much astonished to find that the Church of England has this second volume of the book of martyrs, in which Presbyterians and Independents play the part of Nero and Bishop Bonner ; and perhaps they will be more astonished that, having it, she ever allowed it to become forgotten.

Another point to be especially wrought out is the question who these "2000 Divines" were. This will involve a little inquiry into the way in which the vacancies caused by the sudden ejection of the 8000 orthodox clergy were filled up, and how subsequent vacancies were supplied.

It will be easily shown that a good many very unclerical persons were put in to stop the numerous gaps—troopers and tradesmen, enthusiasts and fanatics. Now these "2000 Divines" have always been exhibited in shadow : we are assured that they are 2000 in number ; but the roll-call has never been produced ; and some great men have been put in front as samples of the rest. But, in truth, there are grave doubts of their number ; though it would be foolish to insist upon the fact that they were not all Baxters, it is forced upon us to look more narrowly than we should have cared to do into their genuine claims to sympathy and respect.

Again, it will be desirable also to take special care to guard the popular mind from a misconception of the nature of the secession itself. In truth, instead of being an instance of the persecuting spirit of the Church, it is a singular example of her forbearing, and conciliatory, and comprehensive temper. If the Church, when restored, had turned out the whole body of the men who had been thrust into her benefices, just as they had turned out the whole body of the orthodox clergy, there would have been something to be said in defence of such a measure. The majority of those men were not, and never had been, clergymen ; and the few who had once been so had long since forsworn her doctrines, and vowed to root out her organization. But, on the contrary, the Church made every endeavour to conciliate them, and win them into the Church. They were at once promised that they should be undisturbed until there had been ample time to discuss differences, and to come to some re-settlement of religion ; and that all who should ultimately agree to that re-settlement, and should desire to enter into the ministry of the restored Church, should be permitted to do so, and to retain the benefices they held ; and Bishoprics, Dignities, and Preferments were at once offered to the most eminent men among them. Two years were spent in the endeavour to conciliate all : but it was found useless to prolong the discussion ; because the vast majority were long ago agreed, and the few dissentients showed no disposition to yield even their most trifling scruples. Then, at length, the Church was re-settled on that liberal and comprehensive basis on which it now exists ; and three months more of grace were given, during which the door was still open to all who could make up their minds to accept the doctrines of the Church, and to receive her Orders. Would any reasonable man have had the Church allow men to occupy her livings who were not of her clergy, or to teach from her pulpits what was contrary to her doctrine ? In one word, was the secession the fault of the Church, or was it the legacy of evil which the Rebellion left behind ?

There is still another point which seems to us ought to underlie all these historical disquisitions. It may be explained that the points on which the "Nonconformist Divines" seceded were not those which the modern political Dissenters allege as the chief points of difference between them and the Church. There is abundant proof that the Nonconformists were strongly in favour of the connection between Church and State ; they held endowments, and would fain have continued to hold them ; they upheld Church-rate, passed an Act of Parliament to enforce them, and had no scruple about seizing the goods of those who would not pay. They were content to accept a liturgy, and a moderate episcopacy. They spoke very strongly against toleration, and one of their first demands was for more regular confirmations. So that the commemoration of these men would not be a celebration of voluntarism or liberty of conscience, or any such great principles ; it would be a celebration of the mere fact of the secession. It is true that many ministers did secede from the National Church on Bartholomew's Day, 1662, and that their secession was the first great schism among the reformed Christians of England. And we think it may be asked boldly of any ordinary assembly of Englishmen, whether they think the origin of our religious divisions to be a subject for national rejoicing ? We feel sure that a great deal of good may be done by pressing home the questions of the failure of Dissent to educate or evangelize the masses, and its lamentable result in dividing the household of Christ against itself, and weakening its hands for every good work. There is a strong yearning after re-union in the minds of great numbers of all denominations of Christians ; and we think that this opportunity should be embraced to urge upon our "brethren of the separation" whether the only hope of that blessed event does not lie in their re-union with the Church, in which there is so much with which they sympathize, and which, as they themselves very well know, is the only effectual barrier against the Church of Rome.

“For Better for Worse.”



ALL difficult undertakings are made more difficult by uncertainty. To know beforehand what to do and what to expect will not of itself give strength to do, nor patience to bear, but strength will be less likely to break, and patience less likely to bend the more exactly that each knows the load to be laid upon it. Another alleviation of difficulty is to know that others, no better than we, have done the same before us; that the task, though hard, is not oppressive, that the journey, though long, is not solitary. These elements, certainty and possibility, are important in every act of the independent will; more important in matters involving the consent and combination of more wills than one; most important when this consent and combination is to do an act that shall be irreversible. But why should any act be irreversible? If human wisdom is not absolute, if second thoughts are best, if failure is not a frequent road to success, why should parties be bound against their will by a single act? If both parties to a bargain wish to reserve a right to rescind it, who suffers as long as one party may not withdraw without the other? What is sought in a bargain but the advantage of the parties thereto, and if these are not judges of their own good, who else assumes to be so? What notice had the contracting parties that there was a third party to their contract more powerful than their separate or united selves? There are contracts not terminable at the will of the parties because of their sacred nature and universal concernment. There is a tacit contract between a citizen and his country, the one promising fidelity, the other protection. There is the solemn and explicit engagement of Holy Orders; and there is the estate of marriage. In all these cases the contract is irrevocable, because something higher than individual interest is concerned therein; indeed the contract changes its character and becomes less a contract than a debt. The citizen is a debtor to his country, the priest to heaven, the wedded pair to society.

Here is reason for the indissolubility of the marriage contract, that it is a debt to society. As Lord Stowell says, marriage is the parent, not the child, of civil society; so the child receives from the parent. The return which society pays to marriage is to guarantee its certainty. This is the one indispensable requisite, all else thereto belonging may be left to choice. Since society receives so largely from marriage she must know to whom she is obliged. It must be open and manifest who are married and who not; there must be no contraband trading in marital rights and privileges. How best to effect this is the problem for the legislator. The difficulty is, to avoid all needless interference in a delicate matter. People expect to do as they like in getting married, though they must do as others do when they are married. The difficulty can be obviated only by general consent, and that consent is all but unanimously pronounced. The legislator's work is anticipated, it is already done, perhaps overdone. Nearly all people, at all times, in all countries, have agreed to initiate the state of marriage by a religious ceremony. This is a singularly appropriate admission, that the assumption of an irremovable yoke requires strength above our own; irremovable, because, notwithstanding customs of divorce and polygamy, marriage has never been regarded a thing to be taken up and laid down at will. This use of a religious ceremony supplies the requisite of publicity. Marriage is made part of public worship, of dedication, prayer, thanksgiving. The priests or ministers of religion who conduct the ceremony preserve its evidence, and thus assure society that the fountain whence flows her purity is unsullied. But is this religious guarantee all that society need demand? It is most appropriate and most prevailing; indeed almost universal consent places religion before marriage, as arming

before fighting. To make the religious ceremony of marriage sole evidence of its legality is to concede much to private liking. Some religious sects are so obscure that their ceremonies lack notoriety; some are so unreasonable that they lack proper seriousness. If all sects and creeds alike are to be witnesses and registrars of marriage, there must be some superiorising central civil authority. This authority does not affect to marry people, but to see that they are really married. Any religious denomination that refuses to the State the guarantee of publicity ought not to be allowed to celebrate marriage.

The State leaves the individual free choice among religious ceremonies, and, if he declines them all, will give his marriage the same publicity and assurance that he could get at church. What then does the State in this non-religious form of marriage? Does she marry the church-shunning couple; or, at least, does her neutral registrar do for them what the priest professes to do? Clearly, he does; so to the previous question, what does the priest in the marriage service? Does he marry the couple? He says to the congregation, "We are come to join these persons in Holy Matrimony." He asks each contracting party will they take the other. He receives the woman from her friends' hands and gives her to the man; then each says to the other, "I take thee;" then the man places the ring on the woman's finger, saying, "Thus I thee wed." Then the priest declares them man and wife. In his first address the priest speaks of the man and woman as though they were passive; they come to be joined, not to join themselves; but the act of marriage is the act of the parties: they agree, they take; they enter the house of marriage, and the priest shuts the door upon them. The priest's opening address declares that he is about to marry the parties, and in the end he declares them married. But the parties marry themselves, and the priest witnesses their marriage. This is the doctrine of that Church that holds marriage as a sacrament. The priest does not administer the sacrament, but the parties do to themselves and to each other. This truth has been insufficiently apprehended, because of a confusion between the marriage state and the marriage ceremony, common to nearly all who speak or treat of marriage. The sacrament or mystery of marriage is the union created and subsisting between the wedded pair, whereby two become one. This mystery is as great and as inscrutable all through married life as it was on the day of the ceremony.

The original law of England was, in 1842, declared by the House of Lords to be that the presence of a priest was indispensable to a valid marriage. This decision was most severely contested, and it is hard to see how it consists with the fact that at all times Jews and Quakers have married without a priest. If the priest was indeed necessary to make a marriage, then the act of 1836 was a very startling innovation. That is called a law to enable parties to contract a civil marriage before a registrar. Here is an example of the confusion aforesaid; it is not a civil marriage, but a civil ceremony of marriage; the marriage itself will be as religious, that is, as binding, as if entered on in church. The object of this law is to relieve persons who dislike the Church service from need of conforming thereto. The advantage belonging to marriage in the church, which the laws sought to retain, were publicity and certainty. Publicity, to ensure that the parties seeking to marry were competent to contract it; certainty, to make it known to the world that they had contracted it. Nothing can secure more publicity than publishing banns in church. By no means can a larger number be advertised of an intended marriage; no challenge so fair to all who might properly impugn it. The practice of licence to marry is of far inferior publicity, depending on little more than the oath of one of the parties. Publicity in either case was further assured by requiring the ceremony to be performed with open doors in broad day-light; certainty was secured by the parish registry. The new law went beyond this security, by requiring copies of all registered marriages to be sent to a central authority, such copies authenticating the fact of marriage.

The law sought to do for all who refused the Church service just what the Church did for those who accepted it. A civil registrar might receive and publish notices of marriage, might grant a licence, and attend to marry the couple. Here the publication, the most important part, is far inferior to that of the Church. Publication in a Union board-room is notice to the guardians only, in a registrar's office it is no notice at all; the registrar's licence is neither better nor worse than the Church licence. The registrar's presence at a marriage gives no security, as he has no special knowledge that the parties are competent to marry, while the certainty that they do marry is secured by registration. Since the registrar fails to give publicity to the initiatory steps of marriage, it would be well to dispense with him altogether till he receives from the officiating minister the copy of the marriage certificate. The condition of this concession, placing all licensed ministers on a foot with the established clergy, should be that the former will give the same publicity of banns as the latter do. The publicity will then be inferior, as no other congregation is so public as the parish church.

It is proposed to introduce into Ireland the system of civil publication and registration of marriage, but without that interference by a civil officer with a religious act that has caused the confusion between a civil and a religious marriage. There is to be a form of marriage before a registrar when parties decline a religious ceremony; but all denominations may celebrate marriage in their own chapels without the intrusion of a civil officer. Publicity is secured by publication of banns in the chapel which the parties usually frequent, and where the marriage is to be celebrated. Presbyterians and Methodists are to have *quasi*-surrogates to grant licences. The hours for celebrating a marriage are extended to 2 p.m. for Church, Presbyterians, and Methodists; and registration follows, as in the English law. These concessions are good, but they leave the whole law on one side too loose, on the other too strict. The Romish priests are still allowed to marry at all times and in all places without preliminary of banns or licence. The strictness is in requiring that the parties, or one of them, shall be married only by one of their own creed. Were all sects equally under the law, there would be no reason why a Roman, a Presbyterian, or a Methodist should not marry any two persons of any other communion, just as the Established Clergy may. The difficulty is with the Romans, though here there is offence enough, when removed, to make a good compromise. Regarding marriage as a sacrament, they will not be limited where or when to celebrate it. But we have shown that the law of the Church of Rome is quite rational on this subject, treating the priest as witness to, rather than as celebrant of, marriage. The *Concordat* should run thus: the priest should give security to the State by adopting rules of notice, time, and place; the State to allow priests to marry Protestants in Ireland and England, and in the latter country to be rid of the registrar till after the marriage. Thus the practice of the two countries in this important particular would correspond, and the law would conform to its original, as nearly as the variety of opinion and the uniformity of self-will can permit.

Body-snatchers.



OD'S Acre has always commanded the reverence of both Christian and Heathen. Whatever measure of belief or of scepticism may pertain to a man, he cannot well tolerate the thought that those whom he has loved are treated after death with indignity. Here in happy England there are few scenes so beautiful as a country churchyard. It is pleasant to pass a summer hour among the green mounds of such a rural resting-place—to study the epitaphs, often quaint, often illiterate, always heartily loving and sincere—to read the history of the village in the legends upon its

tombstones. These modern days are revolutionizing England: the railway-arteries which cross the island everywhere make isolation impossible: and it will soon be difficult to discover a line of peasants who have dwelt in the same village generation after generation. We have no quarrel with such progress. Perhaps it is well that society should become more mobile. The peasant's son may become Archbishop or Lord Chancellor: the boy who beat his schoolfellows at cricket on the green may surpass all England in some special development of intellect. It is well that this should be: there is no country save England in which it would be possible. We think with Wordsworth, that this nation is an aristocracy, born of "earth's best blood,"—that those who speak Milton's and Shakespeare's language need no higher titles. Yet may we be permitted some slight regret for the days when the peasant was as closely connected with the soil as the squire himself. And when we pass a summer afternoon amid the stone records, overgrown with moss and lichen, of a country churchyard, we feel that the time has been well spent. We may recognize no name among those thus chronicled—we may find no touch of poetry among the epitaphs—but we cannot fail to be impressed by the tranquil solemnity which always belongs to death.

Is there any such feeling connected with the modern cemetery? When we enter any of those wholesale establishments for burial, the first sensation is displeasing. The word in its original, *κοιμητήριον*, "sleeping-place," is beautiful; but the modern adjuncts of it are distressing. Those who are happy enough to know that their graves will be dug close to their parish church, may think with pleasure that their beloved friends will pause and remember them on every Sunday and holy-day. Burial in a great cemetery severs such ties as these. The graves are arranged in classes: there is a superfluity of trim adornment, flimsy and unfeeling. Still, if there are cities there must be cemeteries: for burial within the walls of a London or a Liverpool is after awhile impossible. Cowley has a fine line:—

"God the first garden made, and the first city, Cain."

Out of the city has come the cemetery.

The sexton of a cemetery, near Sheffield, has during the past month been accused of resurrectionism. Sheffield, an excitable town, appropriately represented by Mr. Roebuck, rose in hot haste against the man, and tore his house to pieces. We shall not enter into details with regard to his proceedings: it would be too revolting. It seems clear that for some unexplained purpose he kept corpses unburied: what ultimately became of them does not appear. But we suspect that he has been a mild disciple of Burke and Hare. Those two gentlemen, in their great zeal for the cause of science, did not scruple to commit murder. Better, they thought, that a few Scotch people should be put to death, than that anatomy should be incompletely studied. The Sheffield sexton seems to have thought likewise. He had a philosophical contempt for the mothers who wanted their children buried under God's earth: he conceived that they would be far more useful as "subjects" for the Medical School. This, at least, appears to have been his theory. Like some other "advanced" thinkers, he is not unlikely to suffer for being so far before the rest of the world.

We should much like to know the exact amount of advantage which accrues to surgery from *post-mortem* anatomy. No one can think of such a mode of study without a shudder. Still, if the human race are largely benefited—if pain is saved and disease cured by reason of the revolting examination of dead bodies, which forms part of a surgical course—it would be absurd to set up a mere sentiment against a substantial advantage. It is, however, to be remembered that in France even worse things are done. The French surgeons teach by vivisection: dogs and other animals are dissected while yet alive! Can any necessity of science justify such horrible cruelty?

It is proverbial that a first-rate surgeon should unite two qualities not often united: he should be tender and he should be resolute. The resolution we may find—but scarcely the tenderness—in a man who practises vivisection, or who cuts up dead bodies without troubling himself to inquire whence they come. We do not know what will happen to the Sheffield sexton: but any Sheffield surgeon who has been his customer deserves punishment far more severe.

The body-snatching art has changed character of late years—like most other arts, reputable or disreputable. There was some romance about the dashing highwayman of sixty years ago, mounted on a thoroughbred, and daring enough to rob a mail-coach single-handed. His successor is the contemptible forger and swindler, as cowardly as he is dishonest. And, although to rob a grave is about as horrible a thing as any man could undertake, the mad medical students who in years gone by risked their own lives in such adventures were far less culpable than the smug surgeons who pay their ten guineas for a “shot,” and profess to know nothing about the source from which it comes. Surgery must harden the heart and make the nerves callous: otherwise how could a man put his sharp steel into the body of his neighbour’s child, whom the sorrow-stricken father fondly fancies to be lying beneath the graveyard turf? Loving fingers have been passed through that loose, damp hair; loving arms have encircled that chill decaying waist: but now the flesh is to be stripped from the bone by the surgeon’s steel, and a scientific lecture is to be delivered on what a few days ago was human. Is there any *religio medici*?

We make no protest against requisite dissection. We do not prejudice the case of the Sheffield sexton. We merely plead for the reduction to a minimum of such anatomical experiments. The State gives its dead criminals to the dissecting-knife. Deceased paupers are similarly treated, we believe, in some districts: and against this we protest, for surely poverty is not a crime. This opulent England acknowledges it her duty to save the poor from starvation; she has no right to exact payment from their dead bodies. But is a perpetual supply of bodies for dissection absolutely necessary to surgical instruction? And, if it is, whence come the sad number of corpses which must be found in order to supply all the surgical schools of Great Britain? These questions demand reply. For ourselves, we trust that we and those whom we love may lie beneath the shadow of the great yew-trees in our parish churchyard, beyond the reach of adventurous medical students, and many miles away from the dishonest cemetery sexton.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.



JUNE 3.—Mr. Stansfeld, M.P. for Halifax, brought forward the following resolution:—“That, in the opinion of this House, the national expenditure is capable of reduction, without compromising the safety, the independence, or the legitimate influence of the country.”

Mr. Horsman, Lord R. Montagu, and Sir Fred. Smith, had severally given notice of amendments to this resolution, and Lord Palmerston had put the following amendment on the paper:—

“That this House, deeply impressed with the necessity of economy in every department of the State, is, at the same time, mindful of its obligation to provide for the security of the country at home, and the protection of its interests abroad.

“That this House observes with satisfaction the decrease which has already been effected in the national expenditure, and trusts that such further diminution may be made therein as the future state of things may warrant.”

After notice had been given of this last amendment, Mr. Walpole announced that, in the event of its being put

to the House, he should move to substitute for the *second* paragraph the following words:—

“That this House trusts that the attention of the Government will be earnestly directed to the accomplishment of such further reductions, due regard being had to the defence of the country, as may not only equalise the revenue and expenditure, but may also afford the means of diminishing the burden of those taxes which are confessedly of a temporary and exceptional character.”

Before the commencement of the debate Lord Palmerston appealed to the other members who had given notice of amendments to withdraw them, and to allow the sense of the House to be taken solely on his amendment and that of Mr. Walpole, the success of which he should treat as a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Lord R. Montagu and Sir F. Smith consented. Mr. Stansfeld’s original resolution was negatived by 367 to 65. And then Mr. Walpole also withdrew his amendment, on the ground that he had not intended it as equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and could not take on himself the responsibility of proposing it after Lord Palmerston’s announcement of his views respecting it. Consequently the Prime Minister’s amendment was put as a substantive resolution, and carried without a division.

JUNE 3.—Debate at Turin in which a letter from Garibaldi complaining of the conduct of the Government was read. Rattazzi and General Bixio denied many of Garibaldi’s assertions. Crispi, who supported Garibaldi, showed that the object of his party was an immediate invasion of the Austrian territories. The debate ended by a vote of confidence in Rattazzi’s Administration by 189 to 33.

JUNE 5.—The Social Science Congress met for its sixth Annual Session. Full service in the morning in Westminster Abbey. The Dean of Chichester preached a sermon from 1 Kings v. 2. At the evening meeting in Exeter Hall, Lord Brougham, as president, delivered the inaugural address, in which he made the social condition of women one of his most prominent topics.

JUNE 6.—A letter appeared in the English papers from General Klapka to Kossuth withdrawing his name from the Hungarian National Committee, and renouncing henceforth all intervention in the direction of the affairs of the Hungarian Emigrants.

JUNE 7.—Lord Cranworth pronounced the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. D. J. Heath, confirming the sentence of Dr. Lushington, that “Mr. Heath has maintained and affirmed doctrines contrary and repugnant to the Articles of the Church of England.” And as Mr. Heath, who was present, declined to retract his language, the sentence of deprivation was confirmed with costs.

JUNE 7.—The Austrian Parliament came to a vote adverse to the ministry on a question of finance.

In the beginning of the month news arrived that on May 20, the Canadian Parliament had thrown out the Bill for raising a present Militia force of 50,000 men, with a reserve of 50,000 more for the defence of the colony. In consequence of this vote the ministry of Mr. Cartier has resigned, and a new cabinet has been formed, of which Mr. Sawfield Macdonald in the Upper Province, and Mr. L. V. Sicotti in the Lower, are the leading members. They have dissolved the Parliament.

Mr. Cartier, himself a man of French extraction, in the course of the debate, expressed a fear that the rejection of the Militia Bill would be looked upon by many as a proof of the disaffection of the French Canadians to the institutions of the country.

The Federal Government in North America has issued a notification calling for 160,000 more soldiers, and continuing the offer of 100 dollars bounty, and of pay estimated at a shilling a-day more than that of an English soldier.

June 9.—Intelligence of the defeat at Winchester of the Federal Commander, General Banks.

June 13.—Lord Russell in one House, and Lord Palmerston in the other, denounced, in strong terms, General Butler's proclamation about the ladies at New Orleans. Lord Russell also, in reply to a question put to him by Lord Carnarvon, stated that no proposal for a joint mediation between the belligerents in America had been made by France, and that his own opinion was that any such proposal would at present be most unseasonable.

June 14.—The Prince of Wales returned from his Eastern tour, and immediately joined the Queen at Windsor.

June 14.—Intelligence of a great battle in front of Richmond, in which both parties claimed the victory; the Federals admitting the loss of baggage and artillery.

June 17.—Earl Canning died. His death announced by Earl Granville the same evening in the House of Lords.

June 18.—Intelligence is received that the Confederate fleet had been destroyed on the Mississippi, and Memphis in consequence surrendered to the Federals. The Confederates have also evacuated Corinth, and retreated towards the South.

June 18.—Intelligence of a defeat of the French army in Mexico, and of its being driven back with heavy loss to Amozoc on the road to Vera Cruz, where it is fortifying its position. Extensive disease in their ranks. Large reinforcements are being prepared in France to be sent out without delay.

June 25.—Judgment in Court of Arches in the cases of Bishop of Salisbury *v.* Williams, and Fendall *v.* Wilson.

In the former case, the articles of the accusation relating to 1. Inspiration, 2. Justification, 3. Propitiation, were admitted by the judge, those relating to 1. Ideological construction of Scripture, and Messianic prophecies were rejected.

In Fendall *v.* Wilson, several articles were rejected as insufficient to support a criminal charge. The articles 8 and 12 were directed to be reformed; the 14th, imputing denial of everlasting condemnation, was admitted. Leave of appeal given to prosecutor and to defendant in both cases.

REVIEWS.

Miss Sewell on Rome, Florence, and Turin.*

WITH the charming and characteristic inconsequence of her sex, Miss Sewell begins her book by admitting that she ought not to have published it. She avows her inability to offer any information that has not been given by hosts of other travellers, each learned in his own department, and declares that the chief wish of persons like herself must be to look, to enjoy, to form their own opinions, and "to be permitted to keep them to themselves." She acknowledges that on art and a "vast number of other subjects" she is "conscious of not knowing what she does think;" and accounts for this unsatisfactory state of mind by remarking that she was too constantly engaged to have leisure for reflection, that her original impressions were "very vague and indefinite," and

* *Impressions of Rome, Florence, and Turin*, by the Author of *Amy Herbert*. London: Longman & Co., 1862.

that she had neither the "time nor the energy to convert them into opinions before they were gone!"

The loss, however, it appears was not total. Amidst this wreck of matter, as a printer's compositor might say, there still stands erect the figure of the Apollo Belvedere; and Miss Sewell triumphantly exclaims:—"I do know what I thought about *that*, because I took the trouble to inquire at the time."

But after all, there is much to interest in these letters. Written originally for the amusement of her private friends, and then worked up by the help of Murray and Dr. Schmitz, with a little instruction for the sake of those unhappy young persons in the school-room for whom so many handbooks of useful knowledge are compiled, they are all that one has a right to expect, and that is saying a good deal, from an intelligent English gentlewoman. Candid and tolerant in tone, lively in description when she is really interested, and discriminating when she is really informed, free equally from fine-ladyism and strong-mindedness, Miss Sewell will please all those who care to revisit Italy in her company, and to compare her impressions and experience with their own. As to the class for whom her book is more especially designed, they cannot but be benefited by having placed before them a general sketch taken from their own point of view, of what they will probably some day see in detail for themselves, and may learn the importance of making good use of their days of youth and leisure.

With regard to the fine arts, indeed, many of the rising generation are in a better position for profiting by a visit to Rome and Florence than their predecessors were. A knowledge of the general principles of art has been diffused within the last few years, which has produced a perceptible difference in the manner in which it is discussed in society. Technical criticism, though of great value when coming from certain sources, and when addressed to those who understand it, is of course perfectly useless to those who do not. One of the best examples of this style is Reynolds' account of his journey in Holland, but the extracts from his note-book describing pictures would be of no interest except to artists, simply because to every one else they would be unintelligible. Both in print and in conversation, remarks on art, until the last few years, made by those who had knowledge of the subject, were generally intended only for those who were in a similar position. For this there were several reasons, the chief of which perhaps was, that those who had arrived at this position shrunk from the labour of attempting to make a royal road for the ignorant. They knew that to give these latter the capacity to perceive as they did themselves, they would have to open the eyes of their understandings by establishing a whole series of propositions. They reasonably enough doubted the patience of their hearers, and their inclination to receive instruction in the matter. Besides, few even amongst artists were capable of giving this instruction, and they were too much occupied to do so.

In saying, however, that there was not until lately any art criticism by those who were competent to make it, addressed to the public at large, we have not by any means forgotten that there has been some excellent writing of this sort to be found in the literature of the last eighty years. There are, for instance, the admirable *Discourses* of Reynolds; those also of his successors in the professor's chair, Fuseli, Opie, and Leslie; the *Lectures* of Haydon; the *Essays* on the metaphysics of art by Burke, Barry, Chesterfield, Walpole, and others. But still there was no royal road, and no hand-book to it: perhaps there never can be.

Artists and their friends knew more or less about art, and talked about it more or less intelligently; but the public considered that to understand the aims of art was quite unnecessary to enable them to judge of its performances, that they could tell "what pleased themselves," and had a right to the enjoyment of their own "taste," which was, they thought, probably just as good as that of their neighbours. This absurd and pernicious doctrine, that taste is not to be disputed, is now happily not quite so implicitly believed as it was. People have become convinced that

although there is no such thing as a court of chancery in matters of taste, there *is* a code of laws, laws not arbitrarily created, but founded by Nature herself, and to which our individual caprices must bow. The man to whom, it must be admitted, the credit is due of having spread amongst the community a certain amount of knowledge of art, and consequently an interest in it, is Mr. Ruskin. In spite of, or perhaps—who knows—partly on account of his passionate vehemence, his overbearing and dogmatic manner, his affectation, and his very fine writing, he certainly has succeeded in making people listen to him. When he had himself acquired some acquaintance with the principles of art, he fortunately had the inclination and the leisure, which had been wanting to others, to become a teacher. He felt that he must begin at the beginning, and advance step by step, and having done so, the usual result followed. Both he and his pupil have made progress, and have enjoyed the road over which they have travelled. Drawingroom conversation on art is now sometimes more than mere ignorant chatter, a standard of taste is admitted, certain laws are assumed to exist, and a picture or statue has a chance of being really judged and appreciated. It is perhaps too much to hope that for a long time to come our newspapers will not contain a great deal of the worst possible sort of criticism for the public. On the principle of the minister in Scribe's play who gave his friend's son a place in the office of public instruction because he "didn't know anything," many writers constitute themselves art critics, and contrive to fill their allotted number of columns by a mere imitation of the technical talk of painting rooms. They do not understand what they say themselves, and the public do not either. But as the ladies of Addison's day liked mottoes in Greek, so many people still find a charm in the unknown, and at all events think the critic very profound. Although this style is utterly worthless, it has at least a negative merit. Persons who teach, and who are really anxious to teach, are rather apt to fall into an "earnest" tone. Mr. Ruskin, and still more Mr. Ruskin's imitators—of whom unluckily there are now many—are frequently guilty of this sort of writing. The imitators especially, with all the zeal of converts, and with all the self-complacency that freshly-acquired knowledge sometimes gives, having got hold of one or two "truths," new to them, hammer away at them with incredible perseverance, and endeavour to force them into the minds of a perverse generation by every variety of emphatic language. The well-wishers to the progress of art in this country may perhaps fear that this sort of thing will disgust the public; but it is an evil which must gradually work its own cure.

Frederick the Great.*



R. CARLYLE'S third volume commences with the accession of Frederick, on the death of his father, in June, 1740, and closes with the treaty which he made with France before the invasion of Bohemia in 1744. It seems that nearly 800 pages were needed to tell the story of these four years. They are certainly the most important years of Frederick's life, not because they exhibit great designs successfully carried out, but because on them any general estimate of his character must mainly be founded. The history of Frederick has been written and commented upon more than once already. But there is always room for a more minute statement of facts; and the possession of evidence which may correct even a wrong impression is a full justification for publishing it. Mr. Carlyle has carefully examined the career of Frederick; he has submitted the life of the man and the king to a microscopic analysis; he has made use of no second-hand authorities, and in the evi-

dence before him he has allowed nothing to escape his eye. The story will perhaps never be told with greater power or learning. Yet, after all, the main contrast between the long history of Mr. Carlyle and the short essay of Lord Macaulay lies in this, that the latter is a brilliant philippic, the former a detailed and careful eulogy. To say the least, Mr. Carlyle is quite as much a special pleader as Lord Macaulay, or, indeed, as any writer ever could be. He lives in a world of his own. He speaks not as other men speak. He is the apostle of something new, which Englishmen cannot very well understand, but of which, perhaps, it will do them good rather than harm to hear. He is vehemently earnest in enforcing his own conclusions, and he may have grounded these on definite convictions; but it is the necessary consequence of his position that they who do not accept his faith must be repelled by almost every word which is not confined to the mere statement of fact.

The history of Frederick is not a mythical one; it involves no discussion of the laws of historical credibility. The facts can be readily ascertained: it may be admitted that Mr. Carlyle has ascertained them all. The question here is not whether we are to believe certain statements, but how we are to judge of certain deeds and the doers of them. Englishmen are now in the habit of thinking that the history of a nation does not always resolve itself into that of their rulers. There is a growing feeling that treaties and settlements cannot fix national boundaries: that bounds only so assigned will not be permanent. They are accustomed to extend their sympathy to all attempts to recover liberty; and they see in the disruption of ill-cemented empires or confederations the evidence that national unity is not determined, nor even made, by accidental combination under a single government. But they have never doubted, at any time, that some forms of government are intrinsically to be preferred to others; and they have never concealed their own belief that a nation is not free unless it be self-governed. They have shown that constitutional liberty is the result of a very slow, although of very certain growth; and the history of the world seems generally to prove that very few peoples exhibit the capacity for this growth. Still Englishmen are very quick to use their own political convictions as a test for measuring the merits or defects of other governments, and to judge the acts of rulers and kings by their national standard of right and wrong.

Looked at thus, Frederick the Great becomes a man who, after a very strange education, finds himself, while yet a youth, upon a throne, and whose reign, after a very few months of peace, exhibits mainly a series of wars. The opening of his reign shows just enough of promise to give point to the romance of Mr. Carlyle; the sequel of his career exhibits just enough of iniquity to lend a colour to the romance of Lord Macaulay. We are not charging the former with inventing, or even with misrepresenting, a single fact: but we ask how we are to judge of Frederick's life, or whether we are to give up the task as hopeless. According to Mr. Carlyle, he no sooner found himself king than he set to work to make all his subjects happy. It is true that what he did has been done by other rulers, whom we do not therefore particularly praise, and some of whom we call usurpers, or despots, or tyrants; but in Frederick they show, somehow or other, a "fine veracity of character," and a "complete respect for fact." Provisions were not cheap: so he opened corn-magazines, and ordered grain to be sold out at reasonable rates to the poor. He did away with what at the least was never legal in England, the use of torture in criminal trials. He set up an academy of sciences, and hunted about for philosophers, as his father had hunted about for giants. He wished his people to hear news: so he established some newspapers; and the freedom of the press, not granted "in any quite official or steady way," had under him "a kind of real existence, though a fluctuating and ambiguous one." In short, his veracity and respect for fact showed itself in "a marked disinclination to concern himself with censorship, or the shackling of poor

* *History of Frederick II. of Prussia, called Frederick the Great.* By Thomas Carlyle. Vol. III. London: Chapman and Hall. 1862.

men's tongues and pens" (p. 18). All these "phenomena," which to the profane give some show of good intentions, are with Mr. Carlyle "splendid indications, betokening what internal sea of splendour, struggling to disclose itself, probably lies in this young king's mind, and how high his hopes go for mankind and himself." Of course, we know nothing about the sea of splendour except from what he did then and afterwards. He seems to have been an affectionate son; Mr. Carlyle sees in his behaviour to his mother a desire "to shoot forth to greatness in filial piety as otherwise:" with his wife he did not get on so well; and this is set down as "a curious section of his life." The death of the Emperor Charles VI. troubled the waves of the splendid sea. Frederick entered (as the unenlightened might say) on a career of ambition, to become finally the greatest warrior of his age. According to Mr. Carlyle, he was the assertor of just rights, on which the Destinies have stamped their emphatic approval. The commencement of his reign was the inauguration of a new era (which, however, was certainly not the cause of the French revolution and of a world well-suicided); in like manner his attack on Silesia was the rising of a new epoch, the striking of a new hour on the horologe of time. Here, as elsewhere, the abstractions are ready; and the oracle makes revelation. At Mollwitz a new man and king came upon the scene.

"Slumberous Europe, rotting amid its blind pedantries, its lazy hypocrisies conscious and unconscious; this man is capable of shaking it a little out of its stupid refuges of lies, and ignominious wrappings and bed-clothes, which will be its grave-clothes otherwise; and of intimating to it afar off that there is still a veracity in things, and a mendacity in sham-things, and that the difference of the two is infinitely more considerable than was supposed."—P. 320.

Now, what does all this fine talk mean? Does it mean that Charles VI. had no right to make his Pragmatic Sanction, and that the parties to it had no right to give their assent? Was the guaranteeing of the existing Imperial dominions a mendacity or a sham-thing, towards which no good faith ought to be observed, but against which it was the duty of every one aggrieved by it presently and with any weapons to rise up? And if so, on what grounds is this generally asserted? and what were Frederick's reasons in particular? We may think now that the Pragmatic Sanction may be weighed in the same balance with the settlements of Vienna, and that both were worth very little; but then we do so on perfectly intelligible reasons. We do not think that oil and vinegar will mingle in the same vessels, and that there are differences between nations which, when carried beyond a certain extent, make it impossible in the long run to keep them under one government. This is the plain meaning of the current talk about nationalities; and it involves the conclusion that all arbitrary settlements, all alterations of boundary for the interests of a ruler, or of a house, or of a government, as distinguished from the main body of the people, are equally good and equally bad. If Frederick broke the Pragmatic Sanction because the Silesians were forcibly bound to Austria, as Mezentius tied a living and a dead man on one horse, if he had at heart not the aggrandisement of his own power, but the real union of a people forcibly kept under and longing for that union, it is strange that neither Frederick nor Mr. Carlyle should say a word about it. He talks about Frederick's rights, and the claims of his nation, "though he had not been consciously thinking of them in making that adventure" (p. 335); but we hear nothing of wishes or claims on the part of the Silesians. Mr. Carlyle talks of the approbation of the Destinies: but, after all, Frederick's arrangements are not very much more than a century old, and the isolated argument from mere duration is a little premature. It comes to this, that Frederick set aside the Pragmatic Sanction because he did not like it, and that he brought about another arrangement which might be a better one, but which certainly was not grounded on the pleas of Garibaldi and Cavour. It is unnecessary to discuss whether the designs of Charles VI. were or were not justifiable. Lord Macaulay sees in the conduct of Frederick an excess of iniquity seldom paralleled; Mr.

Carlyle simply begs the question when he talks of "our rights on Silesia" (p. 141); and his Hero-worship is in part the parent of the thought that Englishmen feel a permanent personal interest in Frederick's wars, which they do not feel in that war of the Austrian succession on which he vents his full contempt. This war, he says, has been utterly forgotten. He has been busy on Frederick's wars, and therefore he knows them well; but no efforts of the historian will ever exalt them into that class of wars the story of which is fixed in men's minds almost without an effort of memory.

Of Mr. Carlyle's English we say nothing: and it is perhaps useless to say much of his habit of introducing his own comments into the letters and other documents which he quotes. According to the notions of all other historical writers, no habit deserves to be more severely censured. A glaring instance occurs in the letter of December 2, 1740, quoted at p. 153. It is a flimsy excuse to say that the parts inserted are marked by the absence of inverted commas. It is none the less an effort to leave a certain impression on the reader's mind, and is of a piece with the whole historical method of Mr. Carlyle. In short, he does not speak like an Englishman, possibly because he does not feel like one. The liberty of the press, the freedom of the people, are with him gifts that come from the ruler, crumbs which are generously dealt out from the table of the powerful. Frederick's secretaries are as good as Houses of Parliament, with standing committees and appendages. Mr. Carlyle pats his hero on the back for summarily putting down some whimpering of the Parliamentary sleeping-dogs well settled by his ancestors, and holds that a permanent committee, impotent to do the least harm, is an excellent substitute for a free assembly. Throughout he has plenty of commiseration for the poor English people, whose rulers are afflicted with parliamentary noises, and cannot provide for their subjects half so pleasantly and comfortably as Frederick the Great or Louis Napoleon. Mr. Carlyle may be quite right, and the English people, from the days of Alfred downwards, may be all wrong; but there are, nevertheless, two classes of histories, only one of which will be a possession for all time. The great Athenian historian who consciously put forth his own work as such, contented himself with relating men's deeds, without talking of seas of splendour on which his eyes had never rested. He gave letters without comments, and related actions without inferring anything extraordinary from signs apparently not unusual. Above all, he did not hold that political rights were grounded on the power and will of rulers; though it be true that freedom has often begun with them and has worked its way downwards. Perhaps, after all, the poor English people may be pardoned for thinking like Thucydides rather than like Mr. Carlyle.

Life of Edward Irving.*



HERE are two equally appropriate ways in which the life of Edward Irving might have been written. It might have been treated in a calm philosophical manner, in its connection with the history of religious thought; and this, as certainly the more exhaustive, would probably have been also the more satisfactory way, could any one have been found capable of such an undertaking. It could also be treated rather as a poem than as a story. And so Mrs. Oliphant has written it, in a spirit best shown by the words of her own preface:—

"I hoped to get personal consolation amid heavy troubles out of a life so full of great love, faith, and sorrow, and I have found this life so much more lofty, pure, and true than my imagination, that the picture, unfolding itself under my hands, has often made me pause to think how such a painter as the blessed Angelico took the attitude of devotion at his labour, and painted such saints on his knees."

Enthusiasm so true as this, employed upon a subject in

* *Life of Edward Irving.* By Mrs. Oliphant. London: Hurst and Blackett.

which there is such scope for sympathy on the part of an imaginative mind as the life of Irving, could not but produce an engaging book; and accordingly we read with such pleasure, and get, through Mrs. Oliphant's loving insight into the moral nature of the man, so vivid a notion of at least that side of his character, that we can hardly bear to point out how imperfect, and probably how over-coloured, is the intellectual portraiture, and into what lengths of fond diffuseness the facile pen of the author runs, when used for half a volume at a time, not to narrate incident, but to link together, with mere sentimental effusion, the many letters and pieces of diary which have been embodied in the book. Of incident, indeed, there was but little in Irving's life, until the last few stormy years arrived, in which he earned his fame, and met with his persecutions, and indulged in those sad vagaries which have so lowered him in the estimation of the present generation, to whom he is hardly known save through them.

He was born in 1792, at Annan, in that border-land of Scotland which has been, perhaps, fruitful above all others in distinguished men. His early life is painted of course, and equally, of course, in fanciful colours. We are told rather what he probably did, and thought, and saw, than what actually was; and we cannot, it must be confessed, feel safe in believing, till we find him, his college life passed, installed, at the age of twenty, as head-master of the boys' and girls' school of Kirkcaldy. Long and weary was his waiting here. He took orders, and he preached occasionally, but without much "acceptance;" no one would take him as assistant, and he was almost on the point of giving up hopes that he should ever be able to pass beyond that dreary flat of village schoolmastership, in which so many Scotch probationers labour for life, when he was surprised and delighted by an invitation from Dr. Chalmers to become his assistant at Glasgow. He went; but it would appear that he hardly fell in with the views of his superior, and that he chafed, perhaps unconsciously, at his subordinate position. Mrs. Oliphant thinks that Dr. Chalmers did not understand him, and she in consequence displays an ill-repressed prejudice against the former throughout the rest of her volumes; but it would seem more probable that Irving's impatient, gusty nature was unable to comprehend wider and calmer modes of thought than his own, and that his mind, so full of tenderness for the individual, saw a kind of injustice in whatever was concerned rather with the general than the particular. Dr. Chalmers' views were essentially those of a statesman: his rule of men was based on reason; Irving yielded his reason a slave to impassioned imagination, and his manner of influencing others—differing as widely as anything could differ from government—was by identifying their feeling with his own so thoroughly that his opinion was to be accepted almost as a matter of faith. If their nature was too strong to admit of this process, and yet had affinity with his own, he permitted himself to be drawn to them as helplessly as he expected others to submit themselves to him; and hence it was that he took up with such extraordinary readiness, yet regretfully, the spiritual and prophetic phantasies of his later years. With Dr. Chalmers he had no such affinity: and neither, therefore, was calculated to influence the other. Had Chalmers been a man of less note, Irving and he would probably have broken out in open antagonism; but habit of reverence and experience of his higher intellect compelled the younger man to bow, and, indeed, kept the two in fit relation to the very end of Irving's life. As it was, Irving felt infinite relief when an invitation to assume the pastoral charge of a little bankrupt Scotch church in Hatton Garden gave him the opportunity of unchecked thought and action, however obscure the sphere in which they were to be exercised. Nothing could be more disheartening than the prospect which he had before him on his arrival in London. For some time the church had been without a minister, the congregation was scattered, those who were left were poor, and from that part of the town there was no means of sending the voice of his preaching forth to a larger auditory and to more cultivated minds. Yet, by happy

chance, within a few months crowds fought for entrance to the chapel; the Scotch tradesmen for whom it was built were jostled from their seats by all the aristocracy of the South, and for a while Irving was more talked about and written about than any man in England. After three or four years his fame dropped as suddenly as it rose, and his congregation became as undistinguished as that of any ordinary clergyman in regions such as that in which his church stood. Neither the rise nor the fall are matters for much astonishment. The world was electrified, partly no doubt by his intense earnestness, by his love and tenderness, by his real eloquence; but in great part also by his external peculiarities, by his majestic figure, by the deep musical voice, by the strange unwonted garb of words in which his thoughts were clothed; and as the effect of these surface qualities wore off, it began to be thought that a sermon of two hours and a-half was a thing intolerable, especially when everything which the preacher said had an imprint of sameness, from the extremely marked character of his oratory, and from his constant insistence on one or two ideas, which were, or which he considered to be, not sufficiently appreciated by the majority of mankind. Something too of unsatisfactoriness and of deficient logic was doubtless seen through the midst of high-sounding words, and may have contributed to the loss of that popularity which mere emotional oratory can never permanently fix. It is certainly extremely difficult to follow, often to discover any trace of, the reasoning of his written works; and it is difficult to believe but that he lived in a state of continued exaltation, which, while it may have lent a depth and a splendour to his eloquence, must have unfitted him to argue at all upon speculative theology. We have no space here to discuss his theological positions, or even to give an abstract of the troubles which crowded thickly about him from the moment when the attention of the religious world was attracted to them: but we may remark, *en passant*, that his theological history, and its relation to the general course of events at the time, are still almost untouched. Mrs. Oliphant has failed to grasp them, and has therefore failed to put them before us in a sufficiently real manner to be understood or retained; moreover, the way in which she loses her personality by sympathy with her saintly hero in the latter portion of her work, and pours forth a lyric wail over his sorrows and perplexities, prevents her from ever so losing sight of the man for a moment as to be able to cast her eyes with any effect upon his surroundings.

Whatever may be thought of the commencement of proceedings against Irving, it is impossible not to admit that, considering the means of control which are at the disposal of the Scotch Church, the ultimate measures which followed upon his acceptance of speaking with tongues and prophecyings were at least excusable; unless they were illegal, as is alleged with some appearance of truth. The so-called spiritual manifestations which interrupted, with full consent of the minister, the usual services of the Church, may not have been more objectionable in themselves than those which took place during the late revivals; but they were in themselves indecent: people had not then been rendered indifferent to them by habit, and the possessed made more distinct claims to divine gifts than have been put forward of late years. The thing was a scandal, and as there is no person in a position of authority in the Presbyterian Church who can act by persuasion, or mild censure, there was no way of stopping it but by the practical measures which were adopted. That such measures were necessarily had recourse to in the first instance is a fault in the discipline of the Church, not one which should be cast in the teeth of the Presbytery who condemned him; and sooner or later, in any Church, a man so wild and so stubborn in his opinions, must have been expelled or vigorously repressed. But though he would not cede, he suffered; and his health began to give way soon after he was driven from his church in Regent Square. He was no longer his own master, he was guided by the spirits into places where he would rather not have fol-

lowed them,—he was severed from the Church which he loved, and he was told to go forth over the country to organize other Churches: he must have felt himself a schismatic, without feeling quite sure that he was right in his schism. Sick and weary, at last he was sent down, by command of the prophets, to Glasgow in the depth of winter, at a time when rest and a warm climate could alone have kept him alive; and there he died, a victim to his hallucinations. It was a mournful thing that a man so good and so gifted should have lived so unhappy a life, and should have died so miserably, really for little other cause than that he never realized the difference between imagination and faith.

The Church and the Churches.*

 HERE never was a period when attacks on pure Catholicism, the Church of England, and Christianity itself, were more abundant than at the present day; nor ever was the Hand of Divine Providence more conspicuous in overruling all these evil agencies for good. It is remarkable, too, how all assaults on religious truth have been specially directed against the Church of England. In her, emphatically, the sacramental doctrines have been assailed, and she it is that has been made the chief mark for the artillery directed against all Christian Revelation by the writers of *Essays and Reviews*. Such a fact carries much significance. A Church thus the object of hostility to the advocates of superstition and infidelity, of those who believe on no evidence at all, and those who will not believe on any, must surely have some special office in the designs of Providence; and this view is confirmed by the actual results of the warfare. It was by the Church of England that the battle was fought and won against the "Deism" of the seventeenth century. To that and to the Church are owing the imperishable monuments erected by Butler and Paley; men, doubtless, of very different calibre, but admirably suited to the parts to which each seemed providentially called. But if Church doctrines, especially as held and defended by the Church of England, are assailed, we have a true Catholic literature so abundant and so popular, that many, who, but for these attacks, would have lived and died in ignorance of Church doctrine, are now faithful and intelligent Churchmen. The sacraments, from Zuinglian and Rationalistic attack, have gathered about them a deep and ample literature of their own, and their nature is understood where before it was scarcely conceived. Infidelity has reappeared in the garb of Rationalism, only to have its disguise rudely stripped off, and trampled under foot. And now Romanism once more takes the field against the English Church, abandoning some untenable positions of the old ground, but taking up in exchange some vantage-posts which the parliamentary and political enemies of the Church have placed at its disposal.

Dr. Döllinger's work, indeed, is not exclusively, by any means, directed against the English Church, though it is evident that he has treated that part of his subject with studious elaboration, and it is all which our limits allow us to examine. The object of the book is to *prove* Romanism, as it claims to be, infallible and perfect, and all other forms of Christianity totally corrupt, without even a scintillation of heavenly light. This statement is, perhaps, sufficient to show the utter untrustworthiness of the book. Perhaps what Dr. Döllinger predicates of all systems differing from that of Rome is not true of any form of religion accepted in the world; of Islamism, and of classical Paganism, assuredly it is not true. But the monstrous proposition that no Christian community beside the Church of Rome has retained a particle of good, and that Rome

enjoys a monopoly of the article, needs only to be stated in order to elicit universal contradiction—nor is the reader likely to be influenced by the arguments of a writer who could seriously propound it. We do not say that he has set forth this theory *totidem verbis*, but it is the substance of his book, and it must necessarily be believed wherever his book is accepted.

Our readers may naturally expect to know by what process so outrageous a notion is attempted to be rendered plausible. By the very simplest, but the most dishonest of all, the *suppressio veri*, the worst and most dangerous form of falsehood, though the writer does not disdain other methods of less refinement. No doubt there is much excellence in the Roman Church, as we hold there must be in any system which contains the substance of Christianity. This excellence is stated, (with a little ornamentation); and every circumstance of an opposite or qualifying character coolly ignored or omitted. No doubt the Church of England has blots (no Church is free from them,—certainly not Rome): these Dr. Döllinger records, enlarging them with his muddy pen, till they fill all the pages of her history, and not a pure leaf appears. Rome never had a Borgia or a Medici, or England a Taylor or a Wilson. This mode of writing history and theology may tell with the most ignorant and the most shallow—in other minds it will simply create disgust and revulsion; it will induce study of the subject, and a stern catechesis of the witnesses—a process fatal to the cause of Rome and Dr. Döllinger.

The Church which has persecuted to the death, and worse than death, so many sincere men for their religious belief—which originated the Inquisition, with all its horrors—which withholds, as far as possible, Holy Scripture from the people—which, at the present day, is persecuting our countrymen in Spain, kidnapping children in Italy, and putting the works of its own most devoted and faithful priests, where they record awkward facts, into the *Index Expurgatorius*, is represented by Dr. Döllinger as the great guardian of civil and religious liberty! The process, as regards England, is simple. The English Church was in communion with Rome before the Pope's formal excommunication of Elizabeth, *ergo*, argues Dr. Döllinger, the English Church *was* the Church of Rome!

"England had," says he, "in its Catholic days, and with the powerful assistance of the Church, laid the foundations of its political freedom, and carried the edifice far towards completion. It was the Church that the nation had to thank for the Magna Charta of 1215; for the gradual amalgamation and equalization of the conqueror and the conquered, of the Norman and Anglo-Saxon races, and also for the abolition of villenage."

That the Church of England, as distinct from, and even in opposition to, the Church of Rome, was the agent in this instance is evident. Stephen Langton, though appointed by the Pope, acted as the representative of the Church of England, when he laid on the altar his solemn protestation against the Pope's deed. No Englishman, it may be presumed, whatever his religion, will admit that the "political freedom" of his country was founded, and carried far towards its completion, by the abject baseness of John, and the haughty insolence of Pandulf: and the blood of a German must be considerably diluted with allaying Tiber, before a son of Arminius could regard such a transaction in that light. The protestation of Grosseteste, the preaching of Centenarius, the remonstrance of Sewald, are a few of many instances in which the Church of England showed her distinctness from the Church of Rome, even while in ecclesiastical subjection to the Roman patriarch. Dr. Döllinger, according to the received method of his co-religionists, confounds the Reformation of the Church of England with the robberies committed by the Tudors. He forgets that Henry VIII, to whom, for the purpose of bringing odium on the Reformation, it is convenient to ascribe its origin in England, was, in every respect save one, as good a son of the Church of Rome as Lackland himself; and even in that, perhaps, the difference lay solely in the fact, that, while one did not possess the sympathies of his people at all, the other, so far as the Papal

* *The Church and the Churches; or, the Papacy and the Temporal Power.* An Historical and Political Review. By Dr. Döllinger. Translated, with the author's permission, by William Bernard Mac Cabe. London: Hurst and Blackett. Octavo, pp. 474. 1862.

Supremacy was concerned, enjoyed them entirely, and therefore was able to accomplish what his weaker predecessor could not achieve. The spoliations of the seceding Tudors have nothing whatever to do with the doctrines of the Reformed Church. We fear that the persecutions of one of their number are not so easily detached from the tenets of the Roman; but of these we have given us—*οὐδὲ γὰρ*. We are almost surprised that the “Nag’s Head” has not been once more served up. But the author was too wary. His forte, as we have observed, lies not so much in coining or propagating positive falsehoods, as in the suppression of those truths which would make the heavy scale of his advocacy kick the beam. James II., it might have been supposed, was a tough bit of history to deal with. But the courageous Dr. Döllinger is nothing daunted:—

“That it was precisely the Catholic period in England which had been that of increasing civil freedom, and that of the Reformation the time of slavery, absolutism, and the loss of individual right, perhaps not one in a thousand of the English knew, and that one took good care to say nothing concerning it.”

But how was this? A subject of Mary and a subject of James might have conversed with the same person. How was it that all the blessings and liberties of the former glorious “Catholic” reign had so entirely perished from the minds of men? We must conclude that Dr. Döllinger believes James II. one of those who carried the edifice of civil freedom a great way towards its completion, as otherwise we might have expected to hear of the seven Bishops, who resisted the arbitrary encroachments of the Crown on the Church. But on these we have a characteristic reticence.

The Church of England has, we believe, no better friends than her enemies. Their calumnies lead to the examination of her principles, which is good, though not all; while the indication of her faults or defects may well put her children on correcting those evils which “a friendly eye” might not perceive. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*, and an enemy is sometimes the best of teachers as well as friends. Dr. Döllinger’s book is not likely to be used against us by the sects, who would be afraid to appeal to a work which treats them with impartial severity. It may serve to hoodwink those members of his own communion who may be inclined to take facts on his authority; but we are satisfied that, notwithstanding the eulogies with which it has been deemed prudent to promulgate the existence of this work, it will soon subside into its true position of an advocate’s brief, not unskilfully drawn indeed, but incapable of standing the test of a common cross-examination.

Life amongst the Colliers.*

O much, indeed such universal, attention has been of late directed to our Colliers, that any work giving a faithful description of what manner of men they are would probably be acceptable now. The unpretending little volume entitled *Life amongst the Colliers* lately published, not only describes them with fidelity, but carries us completely into the coal-country, places our chairs beside the collier’s hearthstone, making us the familiar confidants of his joys and sorrows, the sharers of his mirth as much as the depositors of his cares. We see rising up before us in the flesh the swarthy giant of the North, (the scene is laid in Yorkshire,) armed with strength of muscle and equal strength of will. Does it strike us as we read, that, if he should fold his brawny arms on his broad breast, the busy wheels of our life’s busy machinery must stand still, and all our home comforts vanish? Our brave soldiers and sailors peril life and limb for us, and all honour be to the heroic; even so “our conscript,” upon whom the lot has fallen to face dangers at least

equal to those of the ocean and the battle-field, to face them in the dark bowels of the earth, should draw forth our sympathy and admiration. *Life amongst the Colliers*, while wholly unpretentious and unambitious in its tone, is evidently written to enlist our sympathies for an interesting class of men, hitherto unknown, and often misrepresented. Profoundly ignorant of the subject in question, we cast it aside, unless when some awful calamity came, as lately, like a thunder-clap, to arouse our attention. We had heard somewhere that our coals were procured by a grimed set of ruffians, who certainly laboured hard, but who received good wages of course, and of course spent them all in drunkenness.

But when it came upon us suddenly that hundreds of these our conscripts had perished by a horrible death, a throb of remorseful pity went through the large human heart of the country. We did what we could to help the husbandless woman, and the orphan child, and we wished, surely all of us wished, that we had known more of, cared more for, sympathized more with the dead.

Perhaps we shall think of them no longer as begrimed ruffians, from whom the delicate lady would shrink with fear. Here is a little mirror held up to us, in which we have true portraits of the Colliers, a dark stain here and there on the rough face, a spot upon the coarse garments, but, as a whole, men formed in God’s likeness, sinewy, iron-strung, independent, it may be rude, but honest, full of kindly feeling and gentle charities, frequently endued with noble pride, and that degree of intelligence which fights too often in lonely darkness for the least glimmer of light, which struggles for crumbs of knowledge, with the energy of determination.

The authoress of *Life amongst the Colliers*, fairly establishes the fact, that it is not only safe, but actually pleasant, to live among them, and to be their friend; her frank evidence also proves them to be capable of gratitude in the highest degree.

Nothing is more striking than the ready wit of these often totally uneducated men. One of them who visited the Great Exhibition of ’51, described life in Oxford Street as “*for all the world it wor like living in a clap a’ shoander*.”

The Squire’s Lady (the authoress of this pleasant volume) got up a singing class to cultivate the real talent found among her poor neighbours; they were practising “All we, like sheep, &c.” one of the men dryly remarked, “Why then, I reckon we ’ll go furdur astray than ever them sheep went, if you don’t help us!”

There was a meeting for the Crimean Fund in the coal-country; a man stepped forward and announced that “he and his mates would give a day’s wage, and he believed that would be a fairish start.” It proved to make ten guineas. A white-haired old man rose up at the meeting and thus spoke, “My lads, I reckon one word will do for all: ‘England expects every man to do his duty.’” Here is a love-story from the coal-country:—

“A shy, rough man calls on the Squire. After a good deal of circumlocution, he brings out, ‘Well, then, I’m bound to get a Missis, and thowt as I’d like to speak first to you; ye see woman as keeps t’house doesn’t do what’s fair about butter and cream, mayhap a wife would.’ This I agreed to, and begged to know how I could help him. ‘Nay, I want no help; I’ve seen t’woman as I fancy, a year sin, she’s a widow, you don’t think that matters? She’s a Warstone woman, she is; but you see, being neighbours, it seemed only right to ask your consent like; if it’s quite agreeable to you it ’ll be pleasanter.’ At the end of a few weeks he returns, looking silly, ‘If you please, you’ll forget that about my Missis, it’s all oop.’ The matter had seemed settled, but the dilatory swain neglected to improve his advantage; the widow sends some one, perhaps a lawyer, to ask his intentions, and get them in black and white, as some one else wanted her, but the indignant hero replies, ‘I said nay, if I don’t send ’em (i. e. letters) afore I wearn’t hev ’em fetched, as if chap scared me; she might tak’ on wi’ Warstone lad for what I cared, if she wor in such a hurry, mayhap I’d go over, mayhap I wouldn’t. She’s bonny to look at!’ (sighing). So the widow did take up with Warstone lad.”

To conclude these brief extracts from a book which has not one uninteresting page, whether the theme be grave or gay,—a copy of Godwin’s *Memorials of Workers*

* *Life amongst the Colliers*. Saunders, Otley, and Co.

being sent to a Collier-blacksmith, he thus speaks in acknowledgment of the gift :—

“‘I am very much pleased with its contents, showing what may be accomplished by application and perseverance. They are noble specimens of our race, struggling undaunted through great difficulties; how encouraging to those about to launch their bark on the ocean of life! I was greatly gratified with some remarks of the author, calculated to inspire courage in those, who, in a more humble capacity, are also endeavouring for the good of their kind.’”

Monastic Life.*



THE very word monasticism alarms many. Some minds recognize nothing in it but overgrown possessions and a profligate use; others, again, nothing but Romish corruption. It met with like disparagement in primitive times, and this without the excuses which may be alleged now. So early as the fourth century the little wit that remained in the worn-out society of Rome was exercised at its expense, and rhetoricians and sophists went hand in hand to chase it from the empire. While Athanasius was recording the marvels which had been wrought by the Fathers of the Desert, public opinion had already stamped them, as S. Jerome tells us, with a title of ignominy. What wonder, then, that in modern times a writer such as Lamartine should have defiled his graceful pen by reviving the thread-bare slander, or that less profound thinkers should take up the cry, “the monks and nuns are but sluggards, fattened at the expense of the people.”

The truth is that even educated people know little or nothing about the history of monasticism, and, the worst is, they pride themselves upon their ignorance. Versed in the impure mythology of Greece and Rome, they can scarcely tell the names even of the leaders of that band of martyrs and confessors who issued from the desert to rescue the world from Arianism, and then returned to their cells, accepting neither rewards nor applause, patiently to wait till fresh dangers should draw them forth anew.

In the midst of ignorance so lamentable the work of M. Montalembert acquires an almost priceless value. Written in language as simple as it is touching, and bearing on every page the evidence of unwearied study and thought, it possesses a charm from which even the most careless will find it hard to escape. But while standing forth as the enthusiastic champion of the monastic orders, M. Montalembert does not attempt to disguise or palliate their failings. And this gives an additional value to his book. Affirming, as he does, that none, even among the enemies of the monks, has studied more attentively than himself the history of their disorders and abuses, he chronicles them, not in exultation, but in sorrow, to show the source from which they sprung :—

“If I threw a veil,” he says, “over the corruption of the religious orders during the last period of their existence, how could I explain to the eyes of Christians, or even of unbelievers, the terrible decree of the Almighty, who has permitted that this long-enduring grandeur should be swept away in a single day, and that the heirs of so many saints and heroes, delivered bound hand and foot to the mortal stroke, should almost everywhere succumb without resistance and without glory.”

But, before proceeding to consider the causes which led to the decay and fall of monastic institutions, it will be well to glance at their object and intentions. First of all, then, monasteries were not designed as mere *refuges* for spirits broken with the sorrows of the world, or disappointed in its ambitions. No idea could be more fallacious. “Monasteries,” says M. Montalembert, “were never intended to collect the invalids of the world.” Rather were they the cherished homes of the strong and vigorous; hallowed sanctuaries where the young, the rich, and the noble might offer their first and best to God. Much less were they places of idleness, as they are commonly repre-

sented to have been. Labour, and that of the most arduous and often repulsive kind, was the very pivot of their existence. S. Basil would not allow even fasting to be an obstacle to work; and this severe rule was speedily received and acknowledged throughout the world as the foundation of monastic life.

The foremost of their duties was prayer. This may perhaps be considered idleness by a generation which prays but seldom, and coldly, and forgets that the highest form of labour is the aspiration of the soul towards God: for to occupy oneself with God, according to S. Bernard, is not to be idle—it is the occupation of all occupations; but who can think of that mighty flood of supplication, rising day and night to heaven, from lonely mountain-tops, from sheltered valleys, or from pathless forests and wastes, without feeling that it must have lightened the weight of the iniquities of the earth?

“Thus,” says M. Montalembert, “as long as the monks remained faithful to the spirit of their institution, their special mission, their first duty, was to pray, not only for themselves, but for all. They have been the veteran and indefatigable champions of Christianity in the holy and perpetual struggle of human prayer with the Divine Omnipotence. Gathered together, and constituted by rule for prayer in common, they were regarded, with reason, by the good sense of the Christian populations, as a potency of intercession, instituted for the salvation of souls and of nations. Thanks to them, prayer existed in the character of an institution of permanent and public force, universally recognized and blessed by God and by man.”

Their second duty was almsgiving. Supported by the labour of their own hands, by the offerings of the rich, the monks became the dispensers of this purified bounty. “Almsgiving,” says Barrère, “is an invention of sacerdotal vanity;” a sentiment which has just enough of truth about it to show in what quarter almsgiving assumed its highest and holiest type. The monks were both the guardians and nurses of the poor. Their houses were a hospital and a hospice. No sickness so loathsome or contagious but it was tended with a father’s care; no poverty so squalid but it could find a welcome in a brother’s heart. Poor-law boards and relieving officers were then unknown. Loving hands did that much of which the civilization of a more enlightened age has perforce made matter of legal and compulsory obligation.

Their next duty was study; and here M. Montalembert expresses himself with singular force and beauty :—

“We can never adequately tell how marvellously their life was adapted for study—for the ardent, active, and assiduous cultivation of letters. We can never sufficiently celebrate their touching modesty, their indefatigable researches, their penetration almost supernatural. We can never sufficiently regret the resources and the guarantees offered by these great centres of literature to the most elevated works of erudition, of history, of criticism, by that spirit of succession, that transmission of an intellectual and moral inheritance, which encouraged them to the longest and most thankless undertakings. Ah! who shall restore, not only to studious readers, but, above all, to authors, these vast and innumerable libraries, always keeping up to the day, and receiving the contemporary stream of all publications seriously useful, which, by that very fact, secured to these publications an utterance which they lack at the present time, and which they ask, like everything else, with anxious servility from the State? Let us add, that we can never regret sufficiently that disinterested devotion to science, apart from the self-satisfaction of vanity, or any material advantage, which seems to have perished with them.”

Their last duty was labour. It was the monks who taught the barbarous hordes of Gaul and Germany to turn a furrow, and to build a house. Masters of every handicraft, it is they who civilized the world. And when we visit the ruins of their homes we may well wonder that without arms, and without money, with nothing to depend upon but voluntary gifts and the sweat of their brow, they have covered the world with memorials of their greatness.

“They have achieved their works in the desert,” says M. Montalembert, “without roads, without canals, without machinery, without any of the powerful instruments of modern industry, but with an inexhaustible patience and constancy, and at the same time with a taste and discernment of the conditions of art, which all the academies might envy them. We say more; there is no society in the world which might not go to their school to learn at the same time the laws of beauty and duration.”

How, then, did they fall from their high estate? The

* *The Monks of the West, from S. Benedict to S. Bernard.* By the Comte de Montalembert. Blackwood and Sons. Edinburgh and London.

question is full of interest and instruction. With great possessions came great political and social power. As monasteries became rich and powerful princes began to fix a greedy eye upon their revenues, and the title of abbot was often conferred upon men who were strangers to the monastic life; and sometimes even upon infants: the chief anxiety being to secure thereby wealth and influence. It was in France that this evil—the leprosy of the monastic system—attained its utmost limits, and in that country the decay of monasteries was the most complete. The *Concordat* between Francis I. and Leo X. gave to the king the right of nominating to all the abbeys and conventual priories in the kingdom; and this power was often exercised to gratify the most unworthy passions—to pension a minister, or to purchase the favours of a mistress. Thus it was, then, that the monks, deprived of their elective power, and misgoverned by men who seldom or never visited their abbeys, gradually shook off the bonds of discipline, and copied only too faithfully the patterns of worldliness and self-indulgence set before them by their rulers.

"Can we wonder," asks M. Montalembert, "at the progress of corruption, of spiritual and intellectual decline? What were they else but so many isolated detachments of soldiers, forgotten by their army, without leader, and without discipline, who found themselves thus naturally exposed, and almost condemned, to all the temptations of idleness?"

And thus the monastic life ebbed away. Some houses died out altogether from downright inanition, it being impossible to find novices to supply vacant places; for it is an instructive fact—and let us chronicle it to the honour of human nature—that recruits have always presented themselves with greater readiness in proportion as the rule was strict. The austerities of Pachomius, his single meal of herbs in the evening, his almost unbroken silence, his protracted vigils, his labour under the burning sun of Egypt, did not prevent 7,000 monks from enrolling themselves under his rule, and presenting to the world an example of Christian sacrifice which has been rarely equalled, and never surpassed.

But why, it may fairly be asked, did not the Popes refuse to sanction the election of these unworthy abbots? They possessed the power of *veto*; why was it not exercised? We commend the question to those among the Roman Catholics who are perpetually taunting English Churchmen with their slavery to the State. Dreary as were the days of the Gregorian era, nothing can be pointed out to vie with the holding of sixteen abbeys by the *infant* Medici, afterwards Leo X.; or the bestowal of the noble abbey of Farfa upon the captain of a band of brigands, who wasted the surrounding country with fire and sword, until he was killed while attempting to carry off his own sister from her bridegroom. The worst of our ecclesiastical appointments become meritorious when placed side by side with the profligacy of Richelieu and Mazarin, or the sordid worldliness of the Cardinals of Lorraine and Châtillon.

The chapter in which M. Montalembert describes the ruin of the monastic system is specially worthy of study. It draws from him thoughts which are seldom allowed free vent in a money-getting age. As Englishmen we shall gratefully avail ourselves of his testimony that the work of desecration and spoliation does not belong to our land alone. If Henry VIII. could dishonour the bones of James IV. of Scotland, who was killed in defence of his country, it is equally true that neither Fontevault or Maubisson were able to shield the ashes of Richard Cœur de Lion, or Blanche of Castile. If England can turn the chapels of priories into dining-halls or picture-galleries, it is no less certain that Catholic France can herd swine in the cloister of Cadouin, while a china manufactory occupies the site of the Chartreuse of Seville.

But while bestowing on the work of M. Montalembert that commendation which it so well deserves, we must not close our eyes to defects in certain portions of it, which are the more apparent from the marvellous symmetry and grandeur of the whole. Matchless as is his sketch

of S. Benedict, and the narrative of the reconquering of the world from the barbarians by the monks, there is yet an air of heaviness, if not of downright monotony, about his description of monastic progress under the first Merovingians. Too much credit is also claimed for legends which at best are but doubtful. M. Montalembert's belief in the marvellous knows no limits. If, therefore, we follow him through these portions of his narrative reluctantly, and even painfully, it only enhances the delight when we emerge once more upon the legitimate field of history.

But the worst defect is the want of fairness which he shows towards the monks of the East. True to the traditions of his Church, M. Montalembert scruples not to say:—

"Even the deposit of ancient knowledge escaped from their hands. They have saved nothing, regenerated nothing, elevated nothing. They ended, like all the clergy of the East, by becoming slaves of Islamism, and accomplices of schism."

It is painful to meet with an instance of such unfairness. On M. Montalembert's own showing the West owes the rise of its monastic system to the East. And has, then, nothing been saved or regenerated? It was S. Athanasius who came to Italy from the Thebaid, with his attendant monks, Ammonius and Isidore. And what was the result of his mission? When Rome had been penetrated to its very heart's core by his preaching, when the descendants of the Scipios, the Gracchi, the Camilli had turned their palaces into monasteries, and patrician ladies, so delicate that they could scarcely set their feet upon the ground, were seen busying themselves in offices which would have been refused by slaves, the tide of monasticism set back again towards the East, and the cell of S. Jerome, at Bethlehem, became the nucleus of a vast emigration of the noblest of the sons and daughters of the West. In levelling this charge, then, against the monasteries of the East, M. Montalembert suffers himself to forget their intimate connection with the West. It is true enough that monasticism in the East has not answered to its early promise, but it is equally true that for a time it was quenched in the West. Even in our own lifetime, between the years 1830 and 1835, 3,000 monasteries disappeared from the soil of Europe. Whatever wonders, then, may have been wrought by S. Benedict, S. Columbanus, or S. Bernard in the West, they are largely indebted for success to their precursors in the East; and any attempt to undervalue or ignore their labours can only end in producing a one-sided version of facts.

Saving these blemishes, we commend M. Montalembert's still unfinished work to the careful study of all our readers. At a time when the Church is in great need of the help of her sons and daughters for the carrying her message to millions of our people at home, and when the principle of association and community, without binding vows, is recognized as one among many means to this great end—when we have sisterhoods—and why not brotherhoods, too?—commanding the respect and the affection of all among whom they minister, it is full of special interest, and it is very valuable to find ourselves brought face to face with the praise and the blame, the virtues and the vices of the old monastic life.

Secularia.*



THE exceptional goodness of *Secularia* would not alone vindicate their right to republication. The collection of fugitive essays on heterogeneous subjects has become one of the most tiresome and provoking phases of the vanity of *dilettante* writers, and deserves the rebuke of critics whenever and wherever it shows itself. At first sight Mr. Lucas's book seems like an instance of this bad habit, and if a little careful

* *Secularia*; or, *Surveys on the Main Stream of History*. By Samuel Lucas, M.A. John Murray.

reflection were not sufficient to clear it of the reproach, would deserve to take its punishment along with the crowd of its inferiors. But for all that has been said of it in certain quarters, there is an unity in *Secularia*. We will not go so far as to say that that unity is always very definitely expressed. The essays are in themselves fragmentary, although they are all of them capable, some in a greater degree than others, of being employed as materials in a single structure. But occasionally their subject-matter is so very special, so local, so nook-and-corner in its character, that its relation to the capital intention of the whole work is hard to be discerned. To borrow a metaphor from the author's fanciful but by no means affected title, the stream-lets upon which some of the surveys are conducted are so far from the course of the head waters, that a careless observer is apt to deny them an outlet into any seaward channel. This remark applies especially to the paper on *The Mediæval Castle*, and to that on *The Mediæval Borough*. What it has become the slang of the art to call "local colouring" is so strong in two essays, which seem to sink into descriptive speculations upon one castle and one borough, that we are not unnaturally apt to forget that the writer intended to take his solitary instances as types of the manifestations of an epoch. Not that Mr. Lucas does fairly leave us with any such excuse. The first of these essays commences with a most explicit programme:—

"The stream of history, like the river Rhine, in a certain part of its course, is lavishly garnished with castles. Castles rise, as it were, from every part of its landscape, and occupy the dominant positions on its terrain. The powers beyond them are dormant or invisible; the world at their base is their own domain, and it is clear that their masters, for a certain space, are the real lords of Western Europe, to a degree which it requires an effort to appreciate in reading the history of the European nations. . . . This phenomenon is a subject for the mind to dwell upon, for it is significant of the transitory nature of feudalism, and it may be explained in an essay, or illustrated by an example. An example may serve to vivify our generalisations, if we observe the experience of some particular castle, which, for England, may have been a fair representation of the rest. . . ."

With an intent quite as clearly defined he opens the paper upon the *Mediæval Borough* thus:—

"The importance of the municipal element, as one of the four corner-stones which lie at the foundation of the modern political edifice, has been stated with such masterly precision by Monsieur Guizot, in his treatise on the *History of Civilization in Europe*, that it is quite superfluous to repeat the substance of his admirable outline. In fact, it is hardly possible to state in a clearer form what the boroughs have contributed to the advancement of the individual and of society. . . . The borough in which the writer himself has taken the strongest interest, from old associations, is that of Bristol; and there are special reasons why Bristol should be preferred as a representative of the purely municipal element in mediæval England."

Clothed with this very plain declaration of purpose, the two papers in question are fairly entitled to take their place among *Surveys on the Main Stream of History*. Without it, they would truly enough be surveys off rather than surveys on the main stream. With it, they are no longer mere archæological disquisitions, but they are fair illustrations of one epoch in the progress of the European races. If England was on the said main stream, then so were her boroughs and her castles; and in contributing a model instance of both, Mr. Lucas has only done for general history in England what some Frenchman should do for it in France, some German in Germany.

The other papers are all more plainly, though not more strongly to the general purpose. A comparison of ancient and modern revolution was a natural exordium to a work which was intended to treat of history, ancient and modern, as one succession of advancement, conturbation, and change. An exposition of the fatuity of all social, intellectual, and theological revivals was necessary to guard against one of the most tempting seductions which falsely-conducted thought upon the past holds out to its more imaginative and hearty students. We should have liked the paper in question better had it kept more constantly in view the difference between a political revival, which is true to nature and feasible, and a social revival, which is false to nature and impracticable. To raise an Italy or a Poland from the dust is the proper work and ambition of

a patriot and statesman; but to make the resuscitated social life of either of the two nations start from the epoch of its fall, centuries ago, would be the hobby of a pedant or the chimera of a fool. But upon this head again we say, read Mr. Lucas carefully, and you will not find that he has missed the point. Upon the coming of the Armada Mr. Lucas had little that was new to say. Mr. Motley, of whose last volumes his essay once evidently was altogether, and now is almost entirely, a review, had anticipated him. Still the continuity, which certain critics will not concede to *Secularia*, would have been imperfect without it; and it is most beautifully written. As to the papers on *The English Alternatives of 1640-41*, *The New England Theocracy*, and *Some Preparatives of the American Revolt*, it would be an affectation of acumen to deny them the highest praise. They go far to condemn *Secularia* on the ground that their author has hitherto dissipated, upon spasmodic efforts, powers that should have been employed upon a long stretch of historic labour. They have certainly committed him for the future. We have been so glutted of late with refutations of that brilliant historical scribe Lord Macaulay, that *The Revolution of 1688*, and *its Historian*, fails in interest. *Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescent*, we feel inclined to say, coupling all due reverence for the combatants with an apology for the illustration. *The Hohenzollern Stage of Hero-worship* is a very brisk and well-conducted attack on that brutal love of the hard heart and heavy hand which has disfigured Mr. Carlyle's later biographies; and *Absolutism in Extremis* is so cleverly argued a disquisition on M. de Tocqueville's *Enquiries*, that it gives us fresh confidence in Mr. Lucas's power of writing history proper. With an essay on *Revolutions in Progress and in Prospect*, the series very properly closes. This paper once more shows that the natural bent of Mr. Lucas's own mind would carry him over the Atlantic for a subject. It is to be hoped that the recognition of talent with which *Secularia* has everywhere been met, with the unwilling no less clearly than the willing, will induce him to forego the fascination of such desultory writing and study as have begotten this volume, and to employ faculties that must be now matured—if a style that is really very rich, and thought that is really consecutive be any indication of maturity—upon some work that shall be of a nature to repay a man for the whole employment of his manhood.

Psychological Inquiries.*



VOLUME of essays from Sir B. Brodie must always be welcome to all readers who deal with more than the surface of things, and are content to follow a plain, quiet, truthful guide along the edge of some topics of great and permanent interest. They will not meet with a single page of fine writing,—in itself a strong recommendation; nor, on the other hand, will they find very much that is new. But they will find something to amuse and interest them in some of the author's remarks, even where he repeats what he has said in former works, or when he touches on subjects on which much has been said by other writers. We speak of his dealing with the edges of some topics which he professes to discuss, because in the course of the dialogues, as each subject is passed to and fro from speaker to speaker, the real point at issue between them too often escapes. A and B are busily disputing away at some one point—of grave or trifling importance—when, lo and behold, just as the reader anxiously looks for some bright, clear solution, some quick stroke of conviction,—the real gist of the matter has somehow disappeared. A nearly had it, B seemed sure of it, when it slipped through the fingers of both. This is, of

* *Psychological Inquiries*, Part II. A Series of Essays intended to illustrate some points in the Physical and Moral History of Man. By Sir Benjamin Brodie, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S., &c. Longman & Co., London, 1862.

course, more or less, the fault of almost all books in the form of dialogue,—the dialogue in print being liable to the very same defect as when the speakers are living men. Only when the speakers are men of thought and genius does the dialogue sparkle into real eloquence, and captivate all ears. Only when the writer is of the highest class as a master of English prose can he make his puppets speak as living men really disputing, and send conviction home to the reader's mind.

If Sir B. Brodie has not achieved this, it is not because he has written without care, and after patient investigation. In both these respects he deserves praise. On many points he has great store of information; he is often acute, and as often painstaking. Good common sense—that most uncommon of condiments—seasons the drift of almost all he has to say; and the reader who wishes to gain a sound common-sense view of such topics as are here discussed can have no better guide than the one before us.

The aim of the book seems to be sound enough. It is to show that the problem as to man's present condition, character, and capabilities, can be solved by reference to no one department of knowledge, but that the observations of the physiologist must be combined with those of the moral philosopher, mutually helping and correcting each other. Researches of this kind, he urges, are not to be regarded as merely curious speculations, but are of real practical importance to every one. It is a great thing to teach a man how to improve his own faculties; to see clearly how far they can be improved, and how far the work lies in his own hands. Any one really in earnest for this matter may here learn how to set to work, and with what chance of success. But to do this he *must* be in earnest, and listen to his teacher as a willing disciple. With these few words of preface, we will glance into the book itself, and endeavour to show our readers a little more closely what it is like; stopping here and there by the way to gather a flower, or to pull up a weed.

The dialogues are seven in number: the three first relating to the scope and nature of human knowledge, and the influence of external circumstances on the mind; the fourth, to human happiness; the fifth, to the intercourse of different classes in society; the sixth, to natural theology; and the seventh, to an hypothesis of the indefinite perfectibility of the human mind. Any one of these subjects would, if fully discussed, suffice to fill the volume; and here being all more or less discursively treated, some of them come rather badly off. Sir Benjamin is apt here and there to be rather inclined to gossip, as indeed most people are when they settle down in a formal way to discuss grave topics for a set purpose. It is not to be wondered at therefore that *Ergates*, *Crites*, and *Eubulus*, now and then wax discursive and garrulous, instead of keeping to the point under discussion. We will begin with a glance at dialogue No. I. At page 5 we find *Eubulus* expressing his opinion that the classics should not be the exclusive studies of our schools, but that other subjects should be joined with them relating to the phenomena of the universe; not with the idea that every boy is to turn out a profound astronomer, chemist, or naturalist, but that he may gain some general and useful knowledge. *Crites*, in reply to this not very novel truth, admits the force of his remarks, but mourns over the narrow range of human knowledge on all such topics as physical and intellectual life. To him the universe seems more or less a puzzle; an assemblage of phenomena, many of them "bearing no evident relation to anything besides." But he supposes that there are in the universe beings of a superior intelligence, possessed of higher powers and a greater range of observation, who are, as it were, behind the scenes, and see into matters beyond mortal ken. Who or what these superior beings are, or what use they make of their knowledge,—he gives us not a hint. But in two other parts of the volume Sir Benjamin alludes to, and leaves them, in much the same vague manner. The mention of them plays no possible part in the argument; but the author seems by their introduction to say, as it were, a word in his own behalf,—“You see I believe in the world spiritual as well as physical, so pray do

not imagine me inclined to any materialistic view of things.” It appears hardly worth while for such a writer to step out of his way to tell us what nobody doubts; but such is the simple fact as it greets us. We, however, continues *Crites*, poor mortals must be content with humbler views, and grope our way as well as we can through all the unintelligible “changes going on around us.” Not that we should be much better off if gifted with higher intelligence, because it seems a question whether extension of knowledge leads to extension of happiness. Wise men are not exempt from human frailties. Is it not also really true that there is “no connection between wisdom and knowledge, that there may be much of either one of them with very little of the other?”

In reply to these speculations, *Eubulus* informs us that human knowledge is limited, but it is marvellous how much has been accomplished. Philosophers are but men; *humanum est errare*; and if knowledge does not improve the judgment, it gives us broader views, and thus more accurate conclusions. Knowledge may not add to happiness, yet the causes which tend to shorten human life are mostly those which produce bodily or moral suffering,—while average life is longer in civilized than in uncivilized countries. The pursuit of knowledge exalts the views, and raises man above low pleasures and sensual enjoyments. Man is an imaginative animal; and there is no better field for exercise of his imagination than the physical phenomena of the universe. Order and design throughout it compel us to recognize “a vast superintending Intelligence.” The horizon of this field is boundless.

Ergates, in reply, goes further. Diffusion of knowledge, he thinks, affects society at large for good; makes laws impartial, and asserts the power of public opinion, while it is necessary to give full effect to the precepts of Christianity. For want of it (this is not very clear) Galileo was tortured, Servetus burned, the Huguenots were persecuted. Where ignorance is the rule, and knowledge the exception, the term civilization does not apply. In the eyes of a being of superior intelligence the Duke of Buckingham dancing at the French court, an Australian savage decked with war-paint and glass beads, Esterhazy with diamonds on his boots, and a negro chief in the cast-off uniform of a general, would be, he thinks, just of one level as emblems of civilization. He deprecates, also, too great an importance being attached to the study of physical phenomena; and urges the claims of psychology, a science as real as astronomy, chemistry, or natural history, meaning by the term all that relates to the operation of the intellect, the laws of our moral sentiments.

Such is the main line of thought in dialogue the first, such is the gist and tenor of its argument; moving evenly along the old track of well-known and well-debated subjects, and on the whole with good sense and moderation, but very rarely throwing any new light on the topics discussed, either in illustration or deduction. And the characteristics of Dialogue I. are more or less the characteristics of them all. We move slowly at best over old ground, where, by most thinking men, definite conclusions have long since been formed; and where raising trifling objections, and old worn-out doubts, is but setting up giants of straw for the pleasure of knocking them down again. Nothing specially disagrees with the reader; but there is no flash of genius, no keen arrow of brilliant illustration or sharp logic to kindle his mind into anything like fervour, or rouse him from the even groove in which all the disputants move steadily on.

Still, our author is always sensible; and common sense is far too rare a quality not to be valuable. Here and there, however, when on the verge of some higher train of thought than the one before him, though still of good sense, he is not so accurate as he might be; as in Dialogue I. where, in speaking of certain *necessary* truths which we at once recognize, for example, that the square of the base of a right-angled triangle is equal to the squares of the other two sides, he contrasts these with other necessary truths beyond our comprehension.

“If,” he says, “we ask why does the Deity exist, or why does any-

thing exist? it is evident that it must be from necessity, and because it could not have been otherwise."

But it is clear that the answer "necessity" to question the first is no fit answer to question the second. To say that God exists, and that all things in the universe exist, by necessity—just as if they *exist* and *are* in one and the same way—is at best but a loose and vague way of talking unworthy of a philosopher, and rather strange in the mouth of a Christian. God exists, indeed, by necessity, *things* exist because He exists;—a broad but inevitable truth lying at the root of all true philosophy and of all Christianity, which it is strange to find such a writer even *appearing* to let slip. But traces of the same want of accuracy of thought and of definition are to be found elsewhere; as in a discussion of the imagination at p. 180, where we read not only that imagination is the essential part of the genius of the poet, but also *the main instrument of discovery in science and of invention in the arts*. It is fortunate that poor Mr. Buckle is not alive to hear what he would call this "astounding heresy,"—*pace quiescat* in spite of it,—and to be told that the imagination furnishes those lights which illuminate the philosopher's path and lead him onward in his journey. It would certainly have hastened his death had he been now alive and at work on that mighty third volume of his mighty history. Even Sir Benjamin himself feels that the assertion is a dangerous one, and instantly qualifies it by adding:—

"Fallacious lights indeed if he trusts implicitly to them, but far otherwise if he takes them for no more than they are worth."

And then he plunges headlong into that second inaccuracy to which we were about to allude, when the thought of poor Buckle diverted us.

"Such," he continues, "is the history of all the great achievements in the inductive sciences, even in those where we deal with absolute certainties; how many crude notions passed through Newton's mind before he invented fluxions; so is it with all human pursuits; whether in the case of Marlborough or Wellington planning a campaign, Columbus directing his course, &c. or Watt engaged in the invention of the steam-engine."

But, surely, nothing can be more vague or inaccurate than such words and such reasoning as this. It is to be doubted exceedingly what share imagination had in Newton's invention of fluxions, the result of long, careful, exact calculation; and however sharply it may have spurred on Columbus to the blessed Islands of the West, it had little to do with such a mind as Watt's, and nothing whatever with the conqueror of Blenheim or Waterloo. The coupling together of these names is altogether hapless and inaccurate. The fierce, rapid conclusions of a soldier have little in common with the slow, patient, elaborate investigations of a mathematician, whether pondering on fluxions or watching the falling apple. The soldier is playing a desperate game of antagonism against an adversary perhaps of equal or superior skill; he watches for the first false move, the first fatal opportunity, sweeping down upon it swiftly and with success, unless he be himself suddenly checkmated. The philosopher has no such enemy. The step which he gains to-day is gained for ever; on it he rises to a nobler, brighter tomorrow, of clearer truth, of brighter vision, more certain result, which no enemy but his own ignorance or presumption can take from him.

One more instance of this want of accuracy, and we have done:—

"The theory," says Sir Benjamin, at p. 202, "as first propounded by the elder Darwin, and afterwards by Lamarck and the Author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, has been not unfrequently viewed with suspicion, as if it had a tendency to Atheism. Yet there can be no greater mistake."

And what do our readers suppose is brought forward as a proof that there can be no greater mistake than the belief that such books have an Atheistic tendency? This, and this alone; one single remark that this system takes for granted as marvellous an act of creative power and wisdom as can possibly be conceived. This marvellous act, we suppose, is the creation of the first germ of animal

life out of which, according to this theory, have grown all the countless varieties which now exist,—the oyster, the elephant, the viper, and the butterfly, all springing from one and the same primary living creature. All one wonders at in reading such an outrageous demand on ignorant credulity is that the inventors of the system did not carry their theory one step further, and having declared that elephants and butterflies both sprang from one and the same parent, do away with the necessity for any parent at all. With that point, however, we have here no immediate concern. Our sole aim is to see how our author treats the question,—having himself introduced it into a desultory conversation. He says,—

"It is a wide question;" (and of its width there is no possible doubt); adding that "there is abundance of evidence that the different species of animals are capable of undergoing certain transformations, &c. &c."

And then he goes on to talk of ill-fed Bosjemen, and Albinos; of varieties in dogs, and in cattle. But of the *abundant evidence* he gives us not one single iota. It may be abundant, and it may be convincing. But, as yet, neither he, nor Mr. Darwin the elder, nor Mr. Darwin the younger, nor the ingenious author of the *Vestiges of Creation*, have condescended to give us any specimens. We have indeed abundance of ingenious speculation, conjecture, theory, and assumption: but we have no solid foundation of data; no close accurate reasoning; no ground, in short, for upsetting a system which commends itself to common sense, philosophical inquiry, and Christian belief, in favour of one which boldly sets all three at defiance.

It is not sufficient for Sir Benjamin Brodie to disclaim all intention of helping on such a system as this, by saying, "Pray don't think me a believer; there are such difficulties in the way that I am far from being convinced of its truth." If he intended neither to uphold, to condemn, or thoroughly discuss it, far better to have omitted it altogether. As it is, he has done neither. He has given no decision at all, where the voice of so able an authority, if anywhere, would have commanded immediate and great respect. This, in fact, is the fault of the book. Subjects are introduced of so wide and so deep an importance as to demand full and accurate inquiry, and are dismissed with hasty generalizations, or inaccurate, shallow criticism, which points to no decision. All these should have been fully dealt with, or altogether omitted; especially as the book in which they appear contains many passages of sound, just philosophy, and happy criticism. Space forbids us to give these *in extenso*; but we may note, as well worthy of careful reading, the whole chapters on the cultivation of the imagination, the nervous force, insanity, medicinal agents, the mutual relation of bodily and mental faculties, the influence of health on happiness. With these subjects Sir Benjamin is evidently at home. He has, probably, more abundant and more accurate information on most of such topics than other thinkers of the day; and if he had strictly confined his dialogues to these, our task would have been a far pleasanter one, and his little volume likely to have attracted a far wider class of readers, and sent fewer away disappointed.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A Summary of the Principal Events of the month next preceding will form part of each number; commencing with No. II.

No. I. p. 37, col. 2, ll. 4 and 3 from bottom, instead of "of 1634" "of 1652" "of 1604" "of 1568."
p. 38, col. 1, l. 22, instead of "a" "no."
l. 23, instead of "two" "ten."

We cannot undertake to return communications.



ADVERTISEMENTS.

WANTED a HOME for the HOLIDAYS, beginning the middle of August, by a Lady who fills the position of Governess in a Clergyman's family. She will devote four hours in the day to teaching, act as companion to a Lady, or take charge of a family, in return for a comfortable home for four weeks, or longer, in a Clergyman's or Gentleman's family. Address, H. C. 30, Care of Messrs. Saunders and Otley, 56, Brook Street, Hanover Square. W.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced TUTORs, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M. A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

SACRED SONGS, by Miss M. LINDSAY, (Mrs. J. Worthington Bliss) :—"Too late, too late," poetry by Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate, elegantly illuminated, 2s. 6d.; "The Border Lands," poetry from "The Dove on the Cross," elegantly illuminated, 2s. 6d.; "Peace, be still," words from Scripture, elegantly illuminated, 2s. 6d.; "The Lord will provide," words from Scripture, elegantly illuminated, 2s. 6d.; "Resignation," words from Scripture, finely illustrated, 2s. 6d.

London: ROBERT COCKS & Co., New Burlington Street.

MUSIC.—Gratis and post free, a CATALOGUE of DRAWING-ROOM MUSIC, by Wallace, Richards, West, Calcott, &c.—Apply to ROBERT COCKS and CO., New Burlington Street, Regent Street, London, W., (where the Hanover Square Rooms may be engaged on all occasions,) and all Music-sellers. N.B.—Pianos for Sale and hire at 12s. per month.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10s.; single sample, 2s.

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices:—

The Complete Suit	52s.	63s.	and	85s.
Morning Coats	25s.	30s.	and	45s.
Trousers	16s. 6d.	21s.	and	26s. 6d.
Waistcoats	10s. 6d.	12s.	and	13s. 6d.
Frock and Overcoats	30s.	36s.	and	55s.

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors, next door to Somerset House, Strand.

GARDNER'S 2l. 2s. DINNER SERVICES

complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3s. 6d. per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7s. 6d. per pair. H. and J. GARDNER (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

K NICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15s. 6d.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25s.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

TOURISTS and TRAVELLERS, Visitors to the Seaside, and others, exposed to the scorching rays of the Sun, and heated particles of Dust, will find ROWLANDS' KALYDOR a most refreshing preparation for the Complexion, dispelling the cloud of languor and relaxation, allaying all heat and irritability, and immediately affording the pleasing sensation attending restored elasticity, and healthful state of the Skin.

Freckles, Tan, Spots, Pimples, Flushes, and Discoloration fly before its application, and give place to a Healthy and Clear Complexion. In cases of sunburn, or stings of insects, its virtues have long been acknowledged. Price 4s. 6d. and 8s. 6d. per bottle.

Sold at 20, Hatton Garden, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

* * Ask for ROWLANDS' KALYDOR.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—ROYAL GERMAN SPA, Brighton. Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by GEORGE WAUGH & CO., Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

St. Mary's, Aberdeen.

THE Rev. F. G. LEE earnestly APPEALS for HELP, to complete the Chancel, Mortuary Chapel, Vestry, and Organ-chamber of this Church. It will be the only Church in Scotland in which half the seats will be free. The sanction of the Bishop has been kindly given in the following terms:—

"Aberdeen, with a population of more than 80,000, possesses, for members of our communion, church accommodation for only about 1,800. Considering, therefore, that the present temporary Church of St. Mary is small, inconvenient, and continually overcrowded; and bearing in mind the obvious duty of lengthening our cords and strengthening our stakes, I quite approve of the proposition for building a new Church for that Congregation, and cordially recommend the plan to the charity of the faithful both here and elsewhere.

"THOMAS G. SUTHER, Bishop of Aberdeen.

"Dec. 27, 1861."

Donations may be paid to the "St. Mary's Church Building Fund," at the British Linen Company's Bank, King Street, Aberdeen.

New Weekly Literary Paper.

The Literary Budget.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF LITERATURE,

THE DRAMA, SCIENCE,
AND ART.

Published every Saturday.

PRICE 3d., OR 4d. STAMPED.

The LITERARY BUDGET (under a new management) will, from and after the 5th inst., become a WEEKLY—instead of a MONTHLY—Publication. This change has been considered necessary because it is believed the want of another Literary Journal really exists.

The LITERARY BUDGET will adopt a very plain principle of action. It will lend itself to no clique—be the mouthpiece of no party. Its criticisms of our Literature will be alike fearless and impartial. LITERATURE, the DRAMA, SCIENCE, and ART, will be fully represented.

Finally, the LITERARY BUDGET does not seek to enter into rivalry with any existing Literary Journal, but will adopt a plan and style apart from them all.

The LITERARY BUDGET may be had from Newsvenders in Town and Country, and at all the Railway Book Stalls.

OFFICE: 7, Burleigh Street, Strand; London.

The Conservative Land Society.

INVESTMENTS can be made either in the Share or Deposit departments, with prompt withdrawal when required. The Interest allowed is five per cent. per annum on Share, and four per cent. on Deposits, paid half-yearly. No partnership liability, and the taking of land is quite optional. Depositors do not become shareholders, and the latter only participate in any profits above the guaranteed Interest. The society has paid from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 per cent. to Shareholders, and they have received $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the past year. Prospectuses explanatory of the Share, Deposit, and Land Departments, will be sent free of charge and postage to any part of the world. Plots of land for sale in 18 Counties, giving the freehold franchise, and securing a safe investment.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.
33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.

12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE. An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

NOISELESS CARRIAGES. Messrs. OFFORD invite inspection of their PATENT PERFECT INDIA-RUBBER TYRES, GLASS FRAMES, PANELS, SPRING BLOCKS, SHACKLES, SELF-ACTING STEPS, IRON WHEELS, &c., which decrease the weight, increase the comfort and durability, and entirely prevent the disagreeable noise experienced in all close carriages.

BROUGHAMS in Six Sizes, also extra light and strong for medical men and hilly countries.

LANDAUS, BAROUCHES, SOCIABLES, CLARENCES, &c.
Patentees, 79, Wells Street, Oxford Street.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

* * A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

Vintage Wine Company.

IMPORTERS OF SPANISH WINES.

XERES COMIDA SHERRY,
Soft, Fine Body, Age, and Flavour.

"A marvel of purity and cheapness."—See Press.

Golden, 18s.; Pale, 20s. per dozen.

Samples for 1s. 6d.

Hampers of Two Dozen carriage paid to any Railway Station.

VINTAGE WINE COMPANY,
14, Bloomsbury Street, London.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.
H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

WINE for the HOLY COMMUNION.

After long and careful search for a PURE SACRAMENTAL WINE, a few casks of very choice and rich "St. Martin," Malaga, landed in 1839, have been secured as possessing every indispensable quality, and will be disposed of exclusively for this sacred use. Price 50s. per dozen, cash. Best Rota Tent, 42s. per dozen. Orders must be accompanied with a remittance. GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, &c., London, E. C.; and Park Row, Greenwich, S. E.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3/. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free. Also, ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY. Capital 100,000/. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

Now ready, price 1s. 6d. each, post free,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC

GALLERY. The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.

BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Moray and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickersteth, Mackenzie, Denison.

DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellicott, Jacobson, Sewell, Guthrie, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolff.

REVERENDS C. Kingsley, Vaughan, Bryan King, Hugh McNeill, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upton Richards, W. Gresley, J. Macknochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. P. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Geyt, J. M. Bellew, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Warehouses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that RICHARD LOADER and Co. have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E. C.

84,000/. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, Mr. STEPHENS, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND Co's.

Literary Announcements.

VALIKANOW'S TRAVELS in CENTRAL ASIA. Translated from the Russian, by Authority. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The ASIAN EXPEDITION. Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers. [Ready.]

The LIFE and TIMES of SIR JAMES GRAHAM. By W. TORRENS M'CULLAGH. 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The AUSTRALIAN EXPEDITION; STUART's Explorations into Southern Australia. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The HISTORY of the BRITISH NAVY, from the Earliest Era to the Present Time. By C. D. YONGE, Esq., Author of "The Life of the Duke of Wellington." 2 vols. royal 8vo. with Plates, &c. [In Preparation.]

JIPHON and PECHERI; Impressions of Japan and the North of China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo. Illustrated. [This month.]

On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. [Ready.]

The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS, from 1842 to 1862. By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. [This month.]

MEMOIRS of the SPEAKERS of the HOUSE of COMMONS. By WILLIAM NATHANIEL MANSEY, Esq., M.P., Author of "The History of England during the Reign of George III.," and Chairman of Ways and Means.

TALES of the OUT-SPAN; or, Adventures in the Wilds of Southern Africa. By CAPTAIN DRAYSON. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

MADAME DE STAEL and the GRAND DUCHESS LOUISE. A selection from the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Madame de Staël, and the Grand Duchess Louise and Saxe Weimer, from 1800 to 1817; together with a letter to Bonaparte, First Consul; and another to Napoleon, Emperor. In 8vo. [Ready.]

The MARQUIS of DALHOUSIE'S ADMINISTRATION of BRITISH INDIA. By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., of University College, Oxford. 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]

LIFE on the NIGER; or the Journal of an African Trader. [In Preparation.]

The LIFE, TIMES, and WRITINGS of the BISHOP of EXETER. By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, of S. Mary Steps, Exeter, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland."

The POLITICAL LIFE of the EARL of DERBY. 8vo. [Next month.]

Some ACCOUNT of BRITISH COLUMBIA. By the Venerable the ARCHDEACON OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. 8vo.

The HISTORY of the CATHOLIC CHURCH from the Day of Pentecost to the Present Time. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, of Sackville College. 4 vols. 8vo.

The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY. By the Author of "Miriam May" and "Crispin Ken." 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]

The LIFE and TIMES of LORD BOLINGBROKE. [In Preparation.]

The INFLUENCE of the CHURCH on the CIVILIZATION of the WORLD. A Contribution to the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM LEE, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. In 2 vols. 8vo.

FAITH and PEACE. Being Answers to "Essays and Reviews" by Several Writers. With a Preface by the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON. 8vo. 12s.

The CRUISE of the SAINT GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION. [Ready.]

The RELATION of CHURCH and STATE, and the Nature and Effect of an Established Religion. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P.

The LATITUDINARIANS. A Chapter of Church History from the Accession of Archbishop Tillotson, in 1691, to the Death of Archdeacon Blackburne, in 1787. By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland.

CALABRIA and the LIPARIAN ISLANDS in 1860. 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

The LIFE of the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

The CHURCHES of the EAST. By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS of the SUCCESSORS of SAINT PATRICK, and the BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS of ARMAGH. By JAMES HENRY THORN TODD, D.D., F.S.A.; President of the Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. [In the Press.]

The HISTORY of the CONSERVATIVE PARTY from the Defection of Sir Robert Peel to the Present Time.

ECCLESIA RESTITUTA. By F. C. MASSINGBERD, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Ormsby.

SERMONS by the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's Church, Wakefield, with a Memoir of his Life. Edited by the BISHOP of BRECHIN.

NORTHERN EUROPE. Denmark, Sweden, Norway. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 2 vols. 8vo. [Ready.]

RICHARD COBDEN. A Biography.

The HISTORY of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, Player and Poet, with New Facts and Traditions. By S. W. FULFORD, Author of "The Great Highway," &c.

The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the Last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo. [Ready.]

The HELIOTROPIUM; or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine. Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Drexelius, by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [This month.]

RECOLLECTIONS of LABRADOR LIFE. 7s. 6d.

The SHANNON'S BRIGADE in INDIA. By EDMUND HOPE VERNY, R.N. With Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Wadlington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 21s. [Vol. II. this month.]

A MIRROR in AMERICA; or, Political Analogies Across the Atlantic. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. 8vo. [Ready.]

ESSAYS on LITURGOLOGY and CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., of Sackville College. 8vo. [In the press.]

CRISPIN KEN. By the Author of "Miriam May." Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Bart., M.P. 2 vols. post 8vo.; Cheap Edition, 7s., with "A Word to Churchmen."

The VALLEY of the MAUDE. By the Author of "Atheline; or, the Castle by the Sea." [Ready.]

The GOUTY PHILOSOPHER. Edited by CHARLES MACKEY. [In the press.]

The AMERICAN CHURCH and the AMERICAN UNION. By HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

WHEAT and TARES. Originally published in "Fraser's Magazine." Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BETTER DAYS. Edited by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." 2 vols. 21s.

The DREAM of a LIFE. By Lady SCOTT. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.

The CURATE of CRANSTON. By CUTHBERT BEDE, Author of "Mr. Verdant Green," &c. 10s. [Ready.]

A WOMAN'S LIFE. A Novel. 2 vols. 21s.

LIFE AMONGST the COLLIERIES. 5s. [Ready.]

LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The LITERARY WOMEN of ENGLAND. 8vo. 18s.

CHURCH RATE a NATIONAL TRUST. By the Venerable Archdeacon DENISON. 8vo. 5s. New Edition.

The LIFE of Dr. WOLFF. New and cheap edition, revised and enlarged, with full-length portraits. 8vo. 12s.

The CIRCUMNAVIGATION of the GLOBE by the Austrian Frigate Novara. English Edition. Containing an unpublished letter from Baron Humboldt. With numerous wood engravings. Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Roderick Murchison. 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 30s. [Vol. II. Ready.]

CONSTANCE MORDAUNT; or, Life in the Western Archipelago. [Ready.]

The STAR of LOVELL: a Tale of the Poor Clergy. [Ready.]

The FIELD of LIFE: or, Sowing and Reaping. Second Edition. 31s. 6d.

CLINTON MAYNARD; A Tale of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. Second Edition. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

Why PAUL FERROLL KILLED his WIFE. New and Cheap Edition. 5s.

The LIFE and CORRESPONDENCE of LORD BACON: a Reply to Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Personal History of Bacon." 8vo. 14s.

REMARKS on ESSAYS and REVIEWS. By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Madras. 1s. 6d.

The CHARGE of the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON, 1862. 4d.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co's.

Army, East India, & Colonial Agency,

66, BROOK STREET, HANOVER SQUARE, LONDON.

(Near the East India House and the Oriental Club.)

Messrs. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & CO. beg to invite the attention of Regimental Messes, Officers, Members of the Civil Service, and other Residents in India, Australia, China, and the Colonies, to their Army, East India, and Colonial Agency, and to the advantages it offers.

Banking Department.

Pay, Pensions, Fund Allowances, Dividends, &c., drawn and remitted with regularity. *Sales of, and Investments in, Government Stock, Foreign Securities, &c.,* effected. Every other description of *Financial Business* transacted.

Supply Department.

Miscellaneous Supplies of every description, including Provisions, Wines, Plate, Jewellery, Books, Guns, Band Instruments, Clothing, &c., carefully selected and despatched by Overland Route, or Sailing Ship, to Regiments, and Messes in India and elsewhere.

Private Orders from Officers, Members of the Civil Service, and Residents in India, Australia, China, and the Colonies generally, are executed with care, economy, efficiency, and promptitude. *All Orders* should be accompanied by full and detailed directions.

Personal Agency Department.

The Constituents of MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. may depend upon receiving every attention to their requirements and instructions. Every assistance will be afforded to their Constituents and their families on their arrival in England, with the view to relieve them of every possible inconvenience. Charge, when required, will be taken of children when coming from India and the Colonies, and arrangements will be made for their education in England.

To those going out to India, Australia, China, and the Colonies, MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. offer their Services to secure Passages Overland or by Ship, and to afford them all necessary information connected therewith. This department is entirely under the direction of a member of the firm long resident in India, who has an intimate knowledge of its language, and the wants and requirements of parties proceeding thither.

All Letters, Parcels, &c., will be received by MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, & Co. for their Constituents (whether in England, India, Australia, China, or the Colonies), to whom they will be forwarded regularly.

Terms.

No Commission charged on Regimental or Private Orders, and a Discount at all times allowed where a Remittance accompanies the ORDER.

GOODS, PACKAGES, PARCELS, &c., forwarded Overland or by Sailing Vessel to India, Australia, China, and all Parts of the World.

BAGGAGE, SHIPPED, CLEARED, and FORWARDED to its DESTINATION.

PASSAGES SECURED.

LETTERS AND PARCELS RECEIVED AND FORWARDED.

Pay and Pensions received for Officers and Civilians of H.M. Indian Service.

Ladies' and Gentlemen's Outfits procured. Supplies Purchased and Despatched, and Commissions of every Description Executed.

By Saunders, Otley, and Co., 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.—HARRY EMANUEL, JEWELLER, SILVERSMITH, &c., to the QUEEN, begs to inform the Public that his **DISPLAY of JEWELLERY** will be found at his **TROPHY** in the Nave, opposite the entrance from the Horticultural Gardens; and his **SHOW of PLATE** in Class 33, adjoining the Pottery Court.

CAUTION.—HARRY EMANUEL, JEWELLER, SILVERSMITH, &c., to the QUEEN, begs to caution all persons against making or selling any articles infringing on his new Patent for "**IVORY JEWELLERY**;" and also against any imitation of his Registered "**WINE COOLER**." He begs, likewise, to inform the Public that he has no Agents for the Sale of the above-mentioned Goods, which are to be obtained only at his Establishment, 21, HANOVER SQUARE, 70, 71, BROOK STREET.

WHEATSTONE'S HARMONIUMS (English), in solid oak cases, manufactured by them, have the full compass of keys, are the best quality of tone, best workmanship and material, and do not require tuning. *Guineas.*

New Patent, five octaves, from CC, double pedals.	6
<i>(The best and cheapest Harmonium made.)</i>	
One Stop, oak case (reduced price)	9
Piccolo Piano Model, one Stop, polished (unique wind indicator)	10
<i>(With soft and distinct tones, and projecting finger-board.)</i>	
Two Stops, one set and a-half of vibrators (polished case)	12
<i>(The extra upper half-set of vibrators adds wonderfully to the effect of the treble, and produces a beautiful diapason-like quality of sound.)</i>	
Three Stops, large size, organ tones (polished case)	15
Five Stops, two sets of vibrators, ditto	22
Eight Stops, two sets of vibrators, ditto	24
Ten Stops, three sets of vibrators, ditto	30

(The best and most effective instrument made.)
For particular description of the above, and other Harmoniums in rosewood and mahogany cases, see Messrs. Wheatstone and Co.'s Illustrated Catalogue, which may be had of them gratis and post free on application.

(The only Exhibition Prince Medalist for Harmoniums, 1851.)
An extensive Assortment of French Harmoniums by Alexandre (including all the latest improvements) at prices from 5 guineas to 150 guineas.

WHEATSTONE and Co., Inventors and Patentees of the Concertina,
20, Conduit Street, Regent Street, London.
The Original Manufacturers and Importers of Harmoniums.

CROSSES of every Material and Pattern.

PHOTOGRAPHS, all Schools and Sizes. Parcels for selection are sent post-free on receipt of 5s., 10s., or 20s.

LECTERN or PULPIT BOOK-MARKS, Medieval patterns.
Catalogues posted for one stamp.

S. B. BEAL, 11, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Theological Books.

A CATALOGUE of Several THOUSAND VOLUMES of Second-hand THEOLOGICAL BOOKS, SERMONS, DISCOURSES, &c. may be had Gratis. Postage One Penny.
THOMAS BAKER, 9, Goswell Street, London.

New ready, 18mo. coloured wrapper, post free, 4d.

ON GOUT and RHEUMATISM. A New Work, by Dr. LAVILLE, of the Faculty of Medicine, Paris; exhibiting a perfectly new, certain, and safe method of cure. Translated by an English Practitioner.

London: FRANCIS NEWBURY and Sons, 45, St. Paul's Churchyard.

Royal Asylum of St. Anne's Society.

Brixton Hill, Surrey, and Aldersgate, London.

PATRONS.

THE QUEEN AND THE ROYAL FAMILY.

ITS Objects—Orphans or not—Children *born in prosperity* whose Parents (Clergymen, Solicitors, Surgeons, Naval or Military Officers, Merchants, or Traders) are *now in adversity*.

Its Universality—It has no local bounds—the Children of *any country* are eligible—3,000 have been succoured.

Its Advantages—Home, Clothing, Maintenance, and Education to 300.

Its Dependence—Voluntary Subscriptions and Donations.

Subscriptions gratefully received by Messrs. SPOONER, 27, Gracechurch Street, or by EDW. FRED. LEEKS, Secretary,
Office, 2, Walbrook, E. C.

THE HISTORY of GIBRALTAR,

and of its **POLITICAL RELATIONS** to **EVENTS** in **EUROPE**, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Thirteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. 8vo.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Now ready, at every Library, a New Novel, 2 vols.

TWO LIVES. By BLANCHARD JERROLD.

Next Week, Mr. Sala's New Work.

ACCEPTED ADDRESSES. By GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA.

. It is from this work that Mr. Sala is giving public readings.

In the press, 1 vol., 8vo.

The PUBLIC LIFE of LORD MACAULAY.

By the Rev. FREDERICK ARNOLD, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford.

Now ready, 2d., No. III.

The LIBRARY CIRCULAR.

"The 'Library Circular' is a complete Librarian's Guide, informing him fully as to the purchase of New and Second-hand Books.

Now ready, at every Library, 1 vol.

CHATEAU FRISSAC; or, Home Scenes in France. By the Author of "Photographs of Paris Life."

This day, 1 vol., 7s. 6d.

PRÉCIS of the WARS in CANADA. From 1775 to the Treaty of Ghent in 1814; with Military and Political Reflections. By the late Major-Gen. Sir JAMES CARMICHAEL SMYTH, Bart. With a brief Notice of his Services. Edited by his Son, Sir JAMES CARMICHAEL, Bart.

This day, 5s.

The TWO PRIMA DONNAS. By GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA, Author of "The Seven Sons of Mammon," "Twice Round the Clock," &c.

Second Edition, this Day, at every Library in the Kingdom, 3 vols.

The SEVEN SONS of MAMMON. By GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA.

London: TINSLEY BROTHERS, 18, Catherine Street, Strand.

380 pages, cloth, 3s., fully Illustrated.

DR. LANKESTER on the USES of ANIMALS in RELATION to the INDUSTRY of MAN. Lectures delivered at the South Kensington Museum:—

On Silk.	On Sponges and Corals.
On Wool.	On Shell-fish.
On Leather.	On Insects.
On Bone.	On Furs.
On Soap.	On Feathers, Horns, and Hair.
On Waste.	On Animal Perfumes.

400 pages, cloth 3s., fully Illustrated.

DR. LANKESTER on FOOD: a Course of Lectures delivered at the South Kensington Museum:—

On Water.	On Wines, Spirits, and Beer.
On Salt and Mineral Food.	On Condiments, Spices, and Flavours.
On Heat-forming Foods.	On Tea and Coffee.
On Oil, Butter, and Fat.	On Tea and Coffee continued.
On Flesh-forming Foods.	On Tobacco and Opium.
On Animal Foods.	
On Alcohol.	

London: ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, Piccadilly.

This day is published, price 1s. 6d.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED AT HIS SIXTH VISITATION
OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF BUCKINGHAM,
IN JUNE, 1862.

BY EDWARD BICKERSTETH, M. A.
ARCHDEACON OF BUCKINGHAM, AND VICAR OF AYLESBURY.

Hold Fast the Form of Sound Words.

AN ARGUMENT ON CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

IN A SERMON

BY R. C. COXE, M. A.

ARCHDEACON OF LINDISFARNE, AND CANON OF DURHAM.

London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place.

New and Important Works for July.

The ASIAN EXPEDITION. Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers.

NIPHON and PECHELI; Impressions of Japan and the North of China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DEFOURBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo, Illustrated.

On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S.

The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS, from 1843 to 1862. By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo.

The CRUISE of the ST. GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION.

NORTHERN EUROPE. Denmark, Sweden, Norway. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 2 vols. 8vo.

The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 21s.

The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain, to the last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo.

New Work by the Author of "Miriam May," and "Crispin Ken."
Now ready, 8vo., 15s.

The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY.

"This work is creating intense excitement in all political circles."—*Morning Post.*

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.

66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Mr. Carlyle's Frederick the Great. In demy 8vo., with Portrait and Maps, Vol. III., price 20s.

HISTORY of FRIEDRICH the SECOND,
called FREDERICK the GREAT. By THOMAS CARLYLE.

Mr. Anthony Trollope's New Work. In 2 vols. 8vo.

NORTH AMERICA. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE,
Author of "The West Indies and the Spanish Main."

"This book should be welcome both for its subject and its author,—for this latest survey of the States is information on an engrossing topic, and it is information endorsed by a popular name. Mr. Trollope promised himself that he would write his own book about the United States as the ambition of his literary life, irrespective of their recent troubles. The circumstance that he has seen them seething in the cauldron of revolution, adds immensely to the animation and interest of the result."—*Times*, June 11, 1866.

Post 8vo., 10s. 6d.

ROADS and RAILS, and their Practical Influence
on Human Progress, Past, Present, and to Come. By W.
BRIDGES ADAMS.

"A suggestive book on matters about which few men are so well qualified to speak as the Author. It will provoke discussion, and win the notice of that wide circle of readers who, while they gratify a strong yearning after useful information, are by no means disinclined for the entertainment of a few good stories."—*Athenaeum*.

Post 8vo., 9s.

EUROPEAN SETTLEMENTS on the WEST
COAST of AFRICA; with Remarks on the Slave Trade, and
the Supply of Cotton. By Captain J. F. N. HEWETT, F.R.G.S.

CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, Piccadilly.

Just published, 8vo. 4s. 6d.

SERMONS on POPULAR SUBJECTS. Preached
in the Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton. By JULIUS LLOYD, M.A.
London: BELL AND DALDY, 186, Fleet Street.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS.—Surplus
Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Max Müller's Science of Language, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices*. Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

WORKS BY THE REV. ASHTON OXENDEN.

Just Published, Fourth Thousand. fcap. Cloth, Price 2s.

SERMONS on the CHRISTIAN LIFE. By
the Rev. ASHTON OXENDEN, Rector of Pluckley, Kent.

Also by the Same.

FERVENT PRAYER. 18mo. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

GOD'S MESSAGE to the POOR. Being Eleven
Plain Sermons. 18mo. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

The STORY of RUTH. 18mo. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

BAPTISM SIMPLY EXPLAINED. 18mo.
Cloth, 1s.

The LORD'S SUPPER SIMPLY EX-
PLAINED. 18mo. Cloth, 1s.

A PLAIN HISTORY of the CHRISTIAN
CHURCH. 18mo. Cloth, 1s.

London: HATCHARD AND CO., 187, Piccadilly.

Now ready, in 1 Vol. Extra fcap. 8vo. Price 5s.

THE LAST DAY of our LORD'S PASSION.
By the Rev. WILLIAM HAMNA, LL.D., Author of "The Life of Dr. Chalmers."

CONTENTS:—

- I. The Betrayal and the Betrayer.
- II. The Denials, Repentance, and Restoration of St. Peter.
- III. The Trial before the Sanhedrim.
- IV. Christ's First Appearance before Pilate.
- V. Christ's Appearance before Herod.
- VI. Christ's Second Appearance before Pilate.
- VII. The Daughters of Jerusalem Weeping.
- VIII. The Penitent Thief.
- IX. The Mother of our Lord.
- X. The Darkness and the Desolation.
- XI. "It is finished."
- XII. The Attendant Miracles.
- XIII. The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ.
- XIV. The Burial.

Edinburgh: EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

Samuel Bagster and Sons.

THE ANALYTICAL GREEK LEXICON to the N
TESTAMENT. 4to. 25s.

A MANUAL for HEBREW STUDENTS.

A MANUAL for STUDENTS of the GREEK NEW T
TAMENT.

MYLES COVERDALE'S ENGLISH BIBLE. A c
Reprint of the very scarce Edition of MDXXXV. With Portrait and facsimile Tit
Second Edition. 4to. 30s.

THE GENEVAN NEW TESTAMENT of 1557. Repr
exactly; with the Arguments, Diversities of Readings, and Annotations "à la
places." 8vo. Half-morocco, 8s.

MANUAL HEBREW LEXICON. 6s.

"The most beautiful, and the most correct and perfect Manual Lexicon we have ever seen."

DEVELOPED CRITICISM of the NEW TESTAMENT
By the Rev. T. S. GREEN, M.A. The steps of reasoning which connect the
Critical Text with the cited Authorities are here traced. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE HEBREW and ENGLISH OLD TESTAMENT
and the GREEK and ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT. Complete in one Pocket Volume.

The COMPREHENSIVE BIBLE, adapted for the Family
Pulpit, and the Study. Complete in 1 vol.; with Coloured Maps, &c. Particulars
and estimates, with every information about Bindings and Mountings, may be had
from the Publishers.

BAGSTER'S POCKET POLYGLOT BIBLE, complete
in a carved oak case.

The COMMENTARY WHOLLY BIBLICAL; an Exposition
of the Old and New Testaments in the very Words of Scripture. 3 vols. 6s.
style of binding.

The BIBLE of EVERY LAND. Illustrated with Special
Alphabets, Ethnographic Maps, Tables, Indexes, &c. New Edition. 4to. 4s.

The CODEX MONTFORTIANUS. 8vo. 14s.

The CODEX ZACYNTHIUS; with a Facsimile page.
Introduction. By S. P. TRIGELLAS, LL.D. Small folio, half-ruled, 2s.

Polyglot Bibles, and Biblical Aids, in great variety.

The Catalogue by Post, free.

London: SAMUEL BAGSTER AND SONS,
15, Paternoster Row, E. C.

Now ready, in fcap. 8vo. price 5s. cloth.

THE SUFFERINGS of the CLERGY during
the GREAT REBELLION. By the Rev. JOHN WILKINSON,
M.A., some time of Exeter College, Oxford, and Rector of St. Mary's
Major, Exeter. Epitomised by the Author of "The Army of
England."

BISHOP OF OXFORD.

Third Edition, crown 8vo. price 6s. cloth.

ADDRESSES to the CANDIDATES for OR-
DINATION on the Questions in the Ordination Service.
SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, Chancellor of the Most Honourable
Order of the Garter, and Lord High Almoner to Her Majesty the
Queen.

Oxford, and 377, Strand, London: J. H. and J. PARKER.

Now ready, in Demy 4to.; 450 pp. Price 36s.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO S. JOHN

TRANSLATED FROM THE ELEVEN OLDEST VERSIONS

EXCEPT THE LATIN, AND COMPARED WITH

THE ENGLISH BIBLE;

WITH NOTES ON EVERY ONE OF THE ALTERATIONS PROPOSED IN

FIVE CLERGYMEN IN THEIR REVISED VERSION

OF THIS GOSPEL.

BY THE REV. S. C. MALAN, M.A.

*Of Balliol College, Oxford, and Vicar
of Broadwindsor, Dorset.*

The Translations are from the Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian,
vonic, Sahidic, Memphitic, Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Arabic, and Persian,
with the Authorized Version, in twelve parallel columns. There are also
at the foot of every Translation; and the Notes on the Revised Version
the second part of the Volume.

London: JOSEPH MASTERS, Aldersgate Street,
and New Bond Street.

Church and State Review.

No. 3, Vol. I.

August 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

Practical Politics.

IN opinion has been industriously promulgated of late that party distinctions have ceased in public life, and that there are no contested principles between the two great political connections of the State. Simultaneous with the propagation of this doctrine has been the most systematic and successful assault in Parliament upon the Church of England that it has encountered since 1640.

An assault upon the Church of England is an assault upon the English Constitution. Are both parties agreed in assailing the English Constitution, or are both agreed in defending it? If the first, let it be known; if the second, the Church cannot be in danger. Both parties cannot be agreed in defending the Church, because measures attacking its rights, its privileges, and its offices, have led, in both Houses of Parliament, to divisions; and, in the House of Commons, to divisions warmly, and often closely, contested. As regards the status and authority of the Church of England, there is, therefore, in Parliament a vehement struggle of power and opinion.

We believe that, throughout the great body of the clergy and laity of the country, there is no difference of opinion upon this subject. What then has occasioned the contrariety between the country and Parliament?

Upon this point it is of vital importance that clear ideas should prevail. They alone can explain past mistakes, make us comprehend our present position, and prevent future mischief.

When Sir Robert Peel, in 1834, re-formed the Tory party, under the title of Conservative, the maintenance of the Church of England, its rights, and privileges, and duties, was a chief element of that reconstruction. On his accession to power he may have recommended some measures for this purpose, the policy of which some may have questioned, but the sincerity of that purpose no one then ever doubted, or now doubts; nor the equal truthfulness of the great body of his followers. Among the pupils and colleagues of Sir Robert Peel were men like Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Herbert, and Lord Lincoln, who were, not only from education, conviction, and sentiment, attached to the Church, but who had ever

recognized in its authority one of the surest supports of Constitutional government.

During the four years that elapsed from the severance of Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues from the Tory party these gentlemen never relinquished the persuasion that, ultimately, the Tory party, from its want of leading men, must recall them to their former posts, and, consequently, no change took place in the mode and spirit with which they surveyed and considered Church questions. But after the death of Sir Robert affairs in this respect soon changed. Both the formation of Lord Derby's government, deemed by them always impossible, and the means by which that ministry was defeated, to which they principally contributed, alike convinced the followers of Sir Robert Peel that the long-contemplated resumption of their former posts in the Tory party was a result more difficult and doubtful than once assumed to be. In a semi-liberal position, acting with Lord John Russell and Sir William Molesworth, but presided over by Lord Aberdeen, their great object was to secure for their section the support of the Church, or, at all events, to prevent its being given to their Tory opponents. Hence the public dogma that Church questions were not to be party questions, and the private combination that they should be managed by a transcendental coterie, which took such an empyrean view of the Church and its affairs that it never deigned to remember that it was the Church of England—a coterie mainly and necessarily sitting on the Conservative side of the House, but secretly sympathizing with Mr. Gladstone, and believing that, under his magical manipulation, Liberalism would in due season become Conservative.

Five years of this management ended in anti-Church measures being carried every year in the House of Commons by overwhelming majorities, in the resisting power of the House of Lords being strained to the utmost—the Whig leaders, in spite of their once passionate protestations, deserting the Church; a bench of bishops, without influence or authority, surrendering at discretion; and eventually Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Herbert, and the Duke of Newcastle, taking office under a Premier pledged to the unconditional abolition of Church-rates.

It was in the midst of this anarchy that some who ventured to believe that the opinion of the country, in matters ecclesiastical, did not agree with that of Parliament, resolved to test the accuracy of their conjecture, and to make some effort to elicit

D

the expression of that public opinion. They knew that half the House of Commons had been returned by Conservative constituencies, and they sought to bring the influence of those constituencies on representatives who, from timidity, or carelessness, or indifference, had failed in upholding one of the most ancient, one of the most beneficial, and still one of the most powerful, institutions of the country.

The moment this appeal was made and responded to the Church and its affairs assumed a totally different position in Parliament. The House of Commons, which is the most practical assembly in the world, recognized that the Church was a party question; to wit, that its friends were disciplined and organized, for party means that and nothing else; the management of affairs was snatched from the feeble transcendentalists, and placed in the hands of the leader of the Tory party and his colleagues, men accustomed to study public opinion, and to discipline and guide it. Committees of laymen circulated admirable tracts; Church Unions, in which clergy and laity acted in concert, sprang up in every district; every rural deanery became the focus of a spirited and enlightened confederacy; the archdeacons lent the wide-spreading influence of their complete and venerable organization; a bold, but, as it turned out, a prudent and successful policy was enforced in the recess of every year, after the parliamentary campaign, by individuals of authority; Churchmen petitioned the Legislature from every parish in the kingdom in favour of their rights and privileges; and in three years, the affairs of the Church being managed in Parliament according to the wise traditions of our public life, the majorities for the abolition of the rate were, in due course, absolutely converted into a minority, and the crowd of measures, all cunningly devised by the Nonconformist conspiracy, to modify, and ultimately abrogate, the status of the Church of England, were triumphantly defeated.

The mode in which the majority against Church-rates was gradually diminished in the House of Commons, not merely in successive sessions, but by various votes, at various stages, in the same sessions, until last year it was defeated by the casting vote of the Speaker, and this year the minority absolutely converted into a majority against unconditional repeal in the same House which three years before had carried that repeal by a majority of eighty, is an instructive lesson to those engaged in public life, and proves how nicely those who are responsible for the conduct of a parliamentary party must distinguish between factitious clamour and public opinion. Without the support of that public opinion, parliamentary tactics, and parliamentary discipline, may be of little worth; but it is equally true that, without the necessary skill and method, public opinion in politics is often disregarded and defied.

There has been, very recently, a pertinent illustration of the advantages of a disciplined Church party in the House of Commons in the instance of Sir M. Peto's Burial's Bill, a measure as pernicious as the abolition of Church-rates, and more offensive. For some reasons, which we have never yet penetrated, but, as we understand, against the advice of the leader of the Tory party in the Lower House,

the Burials' Bill had been permitted to be read a second time, in order that it might be referred to a Select Committee. The great body of the Tory party were dissatisfied and alarmed at this course; but it was represented to them that their dissatisfaction was without foundation, and their alarm had no sufficient cause. It was "all right;" and they were assured that the Burials' Bill would come out of the Select Committee shorn of all the provisions which might outrage Churchmen, and yet in a form very conciliatory to Dissenters. The Burials' Bill came out of the ordeal in question with all its odious features unchanged, and with this additional danger, that its third reading would be moved in the House of Commons sanctioned by a verdict which that House seldom cares to question, the judgment of its own Select Committee. It is probable that the House of Lords would have saved the Church of England from this intolerable infliction; but for a Nonconformist assault upon the Church to be defeated only by the House of Lords is itself a great triumph for Dissent. A defeat in the House of Commons defeats a principle; a defeat in the House of Lords only gains time.

To reject a bill recommended by the Select Committee to which it had been referred was no easy task, but it was one which the Tory party was advised to attempt. The advice was sound, the spirit of the party high, its discipline perfect. The friends of the Church attended on the critical night in great force, and Sir M. Peto, anxious to avoid a shattering defeat, when the moment arrived, withdrew the Burials' Bill, on the plea of the lateness of the session, without a struggle.

It appears to us that, from the foregoing circumstances, only one conclusion can be drawn—that Churchmen should identify themselves with that party in the State which upholds the Church of England as part and parcel of the English Constitution. The position of the Dissenters with reference to the Church is not that which prevailed in the last century and the earlier part of the present. The Dissenters have no grievances. The principle of toleration is completely developed. But toleration no longer satisfies the Dissenters: they require equality; and, without a grievance, they demand privilege. If the Dissenters possessed in this country a great preponderance of wealth and population, the irresistible influence of circumstances might in time occasion a revolution which would break the golden link between Church and State, and change and degrade the whole character of our political and social institutions. But that is not the case. The great preponderance of wealth and population is still on the side of the Church, notwithstanding the backsliding of a timid and yet conceited age. But the Dissenters are determined, unanimous, powerfully organized, and little scrupulous. They possess a greater influence over the borough constituencies than their numbers in relation to the general population authorize. Their politics are practical; and when the politics of a minority are practical, a speculative majority, dwelling in the twilight of theory, will ultimately fall a victim to the noonday energy of busy and determined men. To prevent such a catastrophe is the main object of this journal. In the intense com-

petition of a Constitutional country the Church must organize its forces, like the other institutions of the land. The Church of England is a party question; but the formation of that party should be broad and deep, and it should successfully assert its national character by the variety, and the value, and the vigour of its elements.

The Judgment in the Court of Arches.

HE publication of *Essays and Reviews* is an epoch in the history of the Church of England for two reasons. First, because the book is an organized attempt to revive Latitudinarianism within her pale in some systematic shape; with such adjuncts as should ascertain and fix a fundamental and a fatal change in the recognized position of her ministers. Second, because the resistance which the book has necessarily called forth is slowly but steadily issuing in a clearer perception and recognition of the ways in which this and all like attempts are to be met on the part of the Church.

It is to the want of this perception and recognition, where it still exists, that is to be traced much of the dissatisfaction with which the judgment of the Judge of the Court of Arches has been received by Churchmen. We say much, not all; for the judgment, though based, as we conceive, upon the sound principles of administration of the law, has been, from excess of caution, strained in the direction of those principles further than the case will legitimately bear. One or two instances of this we shall notice presently. Meantime we revert to the ground of so much of the dissatisfaction as is *not* legitimate. There has been and is still in the minds of many Churchmen—and under our past and present circumstances it is not unnatural—a confusion between two processes which are in their nature distinct, but which are, both of them, of necessary application, in a Church established by law, to the case of a book such as *Essays and Reviews*. The first process is Judgment in Synod. The second process is Judgment in the Court Ecclesiastical, and, if there is an appeal, then in the Appeal Court. Now the first is a thing long in abeyance, and has recollections about it which prejudice the revival of its use; but which, if they were in themselves just and true, which they are not, have no bearing upon the present case. We are not, however, concerned with these *quasi*-historical recollections now; and notice them only because of their share in creating the prejudice and producing the confusion.

Now men who confuse in this way have expected from the Court of Arches what they cannot properly have at its hands, even though it be the Court of the Archbishop. And they have expected it the more because their want is a real want, their grievance a real grievance; the want must be satisfied, the grievance redressed somehow or other; and, at present, they do not quite know where else to look for satisfaction and redress. They see a *suit* instituted in the Court of Arches and an indictment preferred in many counts against certain

of the writers of *Essays and Reviews*. In their reverence for Holy Scripture, in their love for the Church, in their anxious care for the precious deposit of the Faith, it seems to them a hard and dangerous and scandalous thing that the accused, being *criminal* upon each and all the counts of the indictment, should not be *found guilty* upon each and all the counts of the indictment. They forget, rather they have not yet learnt, that in a Church established by law there are, not one but, two distinct jurisdictions, having, each of them, its own peculiar function and duty in dealing with every such offence; and which, when both have been applied to it, *but not otherwise*, satisfy the whole case. The Church in her corporate capacity has to be relieved by the act of her corporate representation, in all cases of sufficient gravity and extent, from the imputation which lies upon her of complicity in the publication of an unsound and dangerous book by one or more of her ministers. It is her function and her duty to examine and, if she see cause, to condemn the book. In condemning the book the Church does not reconstruct, but republishes her profession of Faith; and in this way, while she saves her own position, she warns all her children against the seduction of the heresy or heresies contained in the book. This is a procedure in Synod; the *primary* duty of a Church in every such case. It is to be taken in hand at the first fitting opportunity, and is to be carried through irrespectively of the other manner of procedure, if such be taken also. If procedure in Synod be neglected, or be evaded for any cause, the Church is committed to and is, as it were, an accomplice in respect of the heretical book, because the *one* way supplied in the good Providence of God for meeting the evil by the Church in her corporate capacity is not taken by the Church in her corporate capacity. No virtual condemnation, such as that by the individual members of a Synod, or such as that of one part of the Synod but not of the other, can come into the place of a Synodical Judgment. Much less any condemnation by private members of the Church, however learned, eminent, and excellent. Much less, again, any sentence of the Court Ecclesiastical; because it is not the function of the Court Ecclesiastical to republish the profession of the Church's Faith. The function of the Court Ecclesiastical, whether in the first or the last resort, is to say whether the offence charged come within the four corners of the law of the Church, not necessarily as the Church has that law, but as it has been made the law of the land by act of the Crown in Parliament. The procedure here is a criminal procedure against the alleged offender as a citizen who has been admitted into possession of, and has had the undisturbed enjoyment of a certain benefice or benefices guaranteed to him by law upon and under certain conditions. Has he broken the conditions, as these have been defined and ascertained by the law? This is the question for a Judge of the Court Ecclesiastical and for the Court of Appeal. The answer to it will be governed by the same considerations which govern the answer in every criminal procedure in an English court of law. If upon any count of the indictment there is room for the accused to escape, then, so jealously does the law guard the temporal interests of the

accused, however the judge may be persuaded of his criminality, let him escape. If there is no such room, let him be found guilty.

The Judge of the Court of Arches has taken this view of his position and of his function. Doubtless there is very much to be said for it. He has considered, and it appears to us with reason, that the fact of the Court being the Archbishop's Court does not exempt it from the operation of those general rules which govern all cases of criminal justice. He has, therefore, with a precise and unsparing hand narrowed down the ground upon which he stands, and contracted the limits within which it is competent to him to exercise his jurisdiction. It may be said, and, we think, said with truth, in the present case, that he has erred in excess of precaution and care for the temporal interests of the accused. That he has, *ex abundante cautela*, acquitted when, by his own showing, he was bound to have condemned. For example, he has admitted with one hand the Collects as legal evidence of the doctrine of the Church; with the other hand he has rejected the Epistles and Gospels. Again, he has admitted with one hand the most stringent notion of Inspiration as being the doctrine of the Church; with the other hand he has rejected the power of condemning the teaching that the facts of the Inspired Books are fables: *i. e.* he has acquitted what is called Ideology in all its worst and most dangerous extravagance. But all this, though it be a great mistake, and full of evil consequences to the Church, unnecessarily entailed upon her by this judgment—if it stand—does not affect the principle of his procedure. It is only a misapplication of that principle. The principle is the confining his jurisdiction, as in a criminal cause, within the narrowest possible limits.

Having then done this, the judge has, not in form indeed at this stage of the proceedings, but in substance and effect, found both the accused parties guilty upon certain principal counts of the indictment. In other words, having done all that he was bound to do, and, as appears to us, some things which he was bound not to do, for the protection of the accused, he has found that it is impossible, in the discharge of his duty, to acquit. Accordingly, we have now what amounts to a distinct legal condemnation of offences alleged to have been committed by these two writers of *Essays and Reviews*, "contrary to the Articles of Religion and in derogation of the Book of Common Prayer," upon the points following:—

1. Inspiration.
2. Justification.
3. Propitiation.
4. Eternal Judgment.

It is curious to note how, over and above all this, the Judge has allowed himself in many primary points to condemn morally where he has acquitted legally. Whether in so doing he has acted consistently with himself, and with the position he has so carefully taken, is more than doubtful. It seems to us that he has fallen here into the error of confounding the functions of a Court and of a Synod; and has assumed to himself, what does not appertain to him, the exercise of *both* functions.

Upon the grounds above stated it appears to us

that if there is room for some dissatisfaction and alarm, there is more room for thankfulness at this stage of the proceedings upon *both* the accounts which have made the waiting for this judgment a very anxious waiting. Not only in respect of what it has done, but also in respect of what it has not done, the judgment is good. For what it has done, it has clearly established three things:—1. That *Essays and Reviews* is a book such as it is not competent for a man (or men) holding the position of a beneficed Minister of the Church of England to write and publish. 2. That if a Minister of the Church of England write and publish such a book, or part of such a book, and do not retract the heresies therein contained, he must take the legal consequences of his legal position. 3. That a beneficed Clerk may not republish another man's heresy without distinctly condemning it. In respect of what the judgment has not done, the result is that the necessity of judgment in Synod upon the contents of the book generally, and specially upon those which the law does not touch, is become a conclusion which it is no longer possible for a Churchman to resist reasonably or to evade faithfully.

For till this judgment appeared there was some room for saying, according to the loose and shallow dogmatism of the day, that the judgment would satisfy the case one way or the other, and that there was no necessity to look to anything else. This was plainly what it was in the interest of the accused to say; and there were others, not their friends, who did not incline to look judgment in Synod in the face, and tried in this way to get rid of it. Now the Judge of the Court of Arches has cut away the ground from under the feet of all objectors of this class. He has made his position too narrow to hold any one besides himself; and your loose dogmatist is driven to look about him a little for something else to stand upon. Looking about him he finds that there are many offences, besides those which affect the legal position of a minister of the Church of England, which are injurious to the general soundness of the body and of every member of it. That the law does not pretend to deal with all such offences; assuming of some of them that they are too unnatural to occur; of others, that it would be difficult to define them with the necessary precision; of others again, that they are the result of the abuse of a liberty which, in its use, is lawful. On the other hand, if the law did pretend to deal with all such offences, and if it were a necessary consequence of every such offence that the offender should be brought before a court of law, still the Church in her corporate capacity has her own independent action to take; her own proper office and function to discharge in respect of every such offence. The discharge of such office is imperative upon the Church. It is not a thing in respect of which the Church has a choice, to do, or not to do, except so far as to say whether the case is of sufficient gravity, which no man disputes of the present case. This office the Church discharges in her Synod. Speaking in her Synod she republishes her profession of Faith where it has been assailed or compromised, under circumstances which make the assault or the denial of sufficiently grave importance. She warns all her children to "walk more warily in these

dangerous days." The civil penalties of the offence she remits, in the first instance, to the Court Ecclesiastical; in the last instance, to the Appeal Court. So far as the offence comes within the purview of the law, the law will deal with it. The Church's own part remains. She has her own law to satisfy; her own trust to discharge; her own deposit to guard; the good thing committed to her by the Holy Ghost to keep. It is hers, and hers only, to republish her profession of Faith, and to warn her children.

This has not yet been done. The Synod has not yet spoken. It has been a grievous error, but it is not too late to repair it. Let it be done, that the Church be not found unfaithful. Let it be done, and God will prosper it to the keeping whole and undefiled the Catholic Faith by the Church of England, even though there be among her Ministers those who reject and trample upon that Faith, but cannot be visited with legal penalty.

If the conclusions we have drawn respecting the paramount necessity of proceeding to judgment in Synod in this case with all convenient speed be sound and true, as we believe them to be, we trust that no considerations will be allowed to prevent their being acted upon steadily, to the relieving of many consciences and to the silencing of many enemies. It may not be competent to the Court of Law to defend the Holy Scriptures from injurious assault and irreverent insinuation, scattered with unsparing hand throughout the pages of a book which "handles" all things "freely," "in a becoming spirit:" the Church must take that charge upon herself. The Court of Law may not be able to say that it is a crime to teach that the facts of Sacred Books, which the Court itself allows to be Inspired, are fables: the Church must set her mark upon the sin. The Court of Law would maintain the building, but in some particulars cannot interfere to prevent the loosening of the foundation: the Church must keep watch and ward. Because the words "Messianic prophecy" are not found in the Articles of Religion, the Court of Law finds itself with regret unable to vindicate the application to Jesus Christ of "all things written in the Law, and the Psalms, and the Prophets concerning Him:" the Church in her Synod must beware how she fail to supplement and make good what may be a necessary defect of the Court of Law.

The Session of 1862.

BY the time these lines meet the public eye the ordinary business of Parliament will be practically concluded. The lamentable distress which prevails in the manufacturing districts, by entailing an extraordinary duty upon the Legislature, has caused the session to be prolonged beyond that period at which it was expected to terminate; while it is still possible that such news may reach us from America as will justify Government in reconsidering the question of mediation before Parliament is prorogued. But, with these two exceptions, our real work is over; and, as both of them stand

apart from the general business of the session, we shall take our survey of the year's legislation without waiting the event.

Although it has been customary to consider this session as a singularly uneventful one, it will not be found, on close investigation, quite so barren as it seems. It is true that we have had an unusual number of long discussions terminating without a division. But if these have been of such a nature as either to elicit or to create public opinion, so as to afford a more certain basis of operation at a subsequent period, the time which they have occupied will not by any means have been wasted. Such results have in our opinion been achieved upon several most important subjects. On our Revenue and Expenditure, on our National Defences, on Public Education—to say nothing of those subjects on which real party fights *have* taken place, such as Church-rates, and other ecclesiastical questions—the people of this country have both taught and learned a good deal during the last six months. Although, therefore, not many tangible results form the trophies of our late session, yet it is unfair to deny that it has been upon the whole an instructive one. The hunters may have brought home little game; but a large breadth of country has been carefully surveyed and opened up, and light has been let in upon various tangled masses of prejudice and ignorance.

On the great subject of our National Defences the first serious debate took place upon the 31st of March. At that time both Parliament and the public were under the whole influence of the encounter which had recently taken place between the *Merrimac* and the *Monitor*, and there was a general cry for the abandonment of stone forts, and the devotion of all our resources to the completion of iron-cased ships. Lord Palmerston, however, influenced by a variety of considerations, such as that a single experiment was not absolutely decisive, that forts would at all events prevent the approach of transports and the landing of troops, and that contracts had been already signed for the formation of the condemned works, sought to moderate the excitement occasioned by the battle in James River, and persevered in his original plans. Events favoured him as usual. In less than three weeks from the first debate upon the subject the iron target at Shoeburyness was splintered by a smooth-bore gun, and the public driven back upon the old persuasion that both forts and guns were essential to the national defences. Accordingly, when Sir Cornwall Lewis, on the 21st of June, introduced his Fortifications' Bill into the House of Commons, it was no longer so much the question of ships *versus* forts in which the House seemed interested, as in the broader question of the unusual expenditure involved. It was wisely urged by Mr. Disraeli that larger sums should not be expended on our armaments than can be raised by regular taxation, and that loans for such a purpose in time of peace are indefensible. At the present moment, however, considerations of this nature fall upon a deaf audience. The nation just now is in a sort of after-dinner mood when expense is forgotten, and he is the most popular who is for running up the longest bill. Sir Cornwall Lewis's resolution was carried; and there

is no doubt that, whatever be the effect hereafter, it has strengthened Government for the present.

It is not, however, so much the mere sum of 1,200,000*l.* which is what Sir Cornwall Lewis asked for, as the critical state of our finances in general, which stimulated opposition to this measure. The gradually-increasing gap between our revenue and our expenditure, and the falsification of promise after promise, and device after device of Mr. Gladstone is really no laughing matter. And, notwithstanding the strictures which have been passed on Mr. Disraeli's speeches, we think that his three several exposures of Mr. Gladstone's unsubstantial edifice, namely, on the 8th of April, and the 8th and 19th of May, will hereafter be reckoned among his ablest and wisest efforts. It is easy to say they were delivered at the wrong moment, that they ought to have led to a division, or to give vent to any other taunt that may for the moment avert attention from their truth. But when these temporary devices are exhausted, the speeches themselves will be remembered as specimens of sagacity, perspicuity, and imperious logic which have seldom been surpassed in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone's defence on all such occasions has been this. Gentlemen opposite, he says, do not understand the principles of taxation which the last twenty years have established. The more taxes you remit the greater the consumption of commodities, and the greater the consumption of commodities the more money in the long run will find its way into the exchequer. No doubt this would be very sound reasoning if what he took off with one hand he did not reimpose with the other. No doubt it would be a justification of his policy if what he took off with one hand he only reimposed with the other for a limited period; while, that is, the revenue of the country was adjusting itself to its changed conditions. But the remission of taxes which leaves us every year with the most odious of all taxes more firmly fixed upon our shoulders is a boon to which we cannot reconcile ourselves. The most singular circumstance in connection with the permanent income tax is that it does not accomplish even its avowed object. It does not make up for the loss of indirect taxes. For the last two years the deficit is seven millions and a-half. So that we are using up our war income in times of peace, and thereby, as Mr. Disraeli pointed out, destroying one of the chief sources of that respect with which foreign Powers have regarded us, while at the same time we fail to balance our accounts, and get a revenue equal to our wants. These are the lessons which several great debates have taught us at various intervals through the session. And we think that it was a great mistake in Mr. Walpole to allow any consideration to deter him from pressing his amendment to Mr. Staniland's motion on the 3rd of June. He might, indeed, have had good reason to know, what has been since commonly asserted, that the economical liberals would have all turned round and voted against him. But even then, we think, he ought to have stood fast. The success of that amendment, moral or actual, would have shown Government that the House was in earnest: and might have convinced them that at length it was time to pause in their cowardly submission to the Chancellor.

If Lord Palmerston had chosen to go out, he must have chosen to go back again had Lord Derby declined to take office. But to allow a menace of this kind to be kept hanging over the head of the House of Commons, and to prevent all effective opposition to official mismanagement, is surely not the act of either a wise, a powerful, or a patriotic party.

On many other subjects, however, we have reason to congratulate our readers. The ill-advised scheme introduced by Mr. Lowe for revolutionizing our system of education, though far from being thoroughly subverted, has met with so warm a reception as to afford us reasonable hopes of its complete discomfiture hereafter. On the 13th of February the course which Government intended to pursue was explained by Lord Granville in the House of Lords, and Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons. This statement produced from the Bishop of Oxford on the 4th of March a forcible and animated exposure of the ministerial scheme. This was followed by a speech from Lord Lyttelton on the 7th, which, with some reservations, echoed the tone of the Bishop's speech. Lord St. Leonards followed on the same side on the 14th, and such exceedingly faint praise was bestowed on Mr. Lowe's proposition by the Bishop of London that Lord Granville, anxious as he naturally was to make the most of any show of support, was obliged to confess that it was damning. This determined and unanimous opposition, on the part of noble Lords and Prelates by no means accustomed to act together in public life, had to some extent the desired effect. Mr. Walpole proposed a series of resolutions in the House of Commons to which, after a long debate, the Government was compelled to yield, and on the 28th of March Mr. Lowe came forward to announce that the Revised Code was withdrawn. When, however, the Code, as amended by Mr. Lowe, was again submitted to the House it did not give that general satisfaction which had been at first anticipated. While one or two blundering provisions had been cancelled, some of its most objectionable features were continued in a modified shape; and it was announced by the Conservative leaders that, though unwilling for the present to offer any further opposition, even this thrice Revised Code could only be tolerated as an experiment. We fear, indeed, that little real change can be looked for while Mr. Lowe continues where he is. The case of Crishall, a parish in Essex, brought forward by the Bishop of Rochester on the 5th of June sufficiently shows the *animus* with which Mr. Lowe is determined to administer his department. Other such cases were quoted by the Bishops of Worcester, S. Asaph, and S. David's, prelates who cannot be suspected of hostility to the present Government, by which it clearly appeared that Mr. Lowe had been withholding money from schools in connection with the National Society without having the slightest official or legal right so to do. Of course, if individuals are thus at liberty to substitute their own "discretion" for the plain meaning of an Act of Parliament, we might just as well have no Parliament at all, and no opposition to the Government.

On questions peculiar to the Church we have

fortunately nothing to record but a series of Conservative successes. The Marriages of Affinity Bill was defeated on the 12th of March by a majority of thirty-two. The Clergy Relief Bill was read a first time on the same day; was referred to a Select Committee on the 9th of April; and was finally, July the 9th, defeated on the third reading by a majority of ten. Sir John Trelawny's Bill for the Abolition of Church-rates was defeated on the second reading by a majority of one. And Mr. Sotherton Estcourt having on the 24th of June withdrawn the resolutions which, according to promise, he had introduced, the question now remains in the hands of the Government. The Nonconformists' Burial Bill was withdrawn on the 8th of July. In the House of Lords, Lord Ebury's Bill for the Amendment of the Act of Uniformity was withdrawn on the 29th of May. And last, but not least, the subject of "Dilapidations," so practically interesting to the whole body of the clergy, has been dealt with by the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose Bill is now under the consideration of a Select Committee.

Of Law Reform two important measures have been successfully carried through the Legislature, namely, the Transfer of Land Bill, and the Lunacy Regulation Bill; though whether the working of either will equal the expectations of their authors is held doubtful by the gentlemen of the bar. Of measures more immediately affecting Parliament, though a variety have been introduced, none have had the luck to pass. A solitary whisper of reform was heard from Mr. Cox on the 14th of February, but was never repeated. Mr. White, on the 12th of February, introduced a motion for expediting the business of the House; but as the tendency of his plan, in common with many others devised for the same purpose, was to curtail the expression of grievances, those great constitutional champions, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli, united in opposing it. About a month afterwards an attempt was made by Lord Robert Montagu to bring the expenditure of Government more immediately under the control of the House of Commons; but the House would have nothing to do with it, and rejected it by three to one. The Ballot, having stolen a majority on the first reading, was defeated by a great majority on the second; and the Conveyance of Voters' Bill, introduced by Mr. Collier, and supported by Government, was thrown out early in the session by a majority of thirty.

Of what may be called miscellaneous subjects we have had the Thames Embankment Bill, the Inns of Court Bill, the Prize-money debate, and the Night Poaching Bill. The first of these has created an amount of excitement which very few political questions have the power to kindle. The issue at which it has arrived is the natural and legitimate issue, and, as such, has been loyally and gracefully accepted by the Duke of Buccleuch. The benchers of the Inns of Court have been respite for the present, and as the conduct of Mr. Digby Seymour has probably taught them the folly of clemency, they will perhaps not again repeat the offence which has drawn down the indignation of the whole rodent tribe upon their heads. The debates on the Kertch and Yenikale prize-money have been

perhaps the most damaging to Government of any that have occurred during the session. And the public will not readily forget that it was actually in contemplation by Government to throw over the claimants altogether, on the plea, forsooth, of public economy. The Night Poaching Bill has not yet passed through its last stages. Measures of this kind are at a peculiar disadvantage at the present day. Most newspaper writers in London are as profoundly ignorant of the true bearings of this question as their own inkstands; but the "liberal" journals are filled with denunciations of the measure which would raise a smile in any one but a cockney, whether Radical or Tory. There is no choice between the enactment of some such Bill—we do not say *this* Bill—and the total abolition of the game laws.

In Foreign and Colonial politics we have little to record, though that little is of vast importance. Parliament has shown great wisdom and self-control in abstaining, as far as was possible, from all discussion on America. At the commencement of the session the public was still smarting under the irritation naturally produced by the seizure of the Trent packet. But the temptation to invectives and recriminations was overborne; and though a few discussions took place in February and March on the propriety of breaking the blockade, and in June and July on the propriety of acknowledging the South, we have neither a great debate nor a single division to record upon either of these subjects. Parliament as well as the public has pretty well made up its mind upon the merits of the quarrel. But it is easy to see that the longer we abstain from interference the better the position we shall hold. And though the distress of our cotton manufactures is a powerful incentive to action, it is to be hoped that private benevolence will save us from the necessity of intervention, until American affairs have reached that crisis at which it ceases to be impolitic or unjust. When the folly of all attempts on the part of the North to reconquer the seceding states, by the utmost possible exertions, shall have become manifest to itself, as it has long been to the whole world, then, and not till then, will the mediation of England become right. Meantime the magnitude of the interests at stake in this afflicting war have diverted our attention from other subjects, in which we are not lightly interested. Debates both in the Lords and Commons on the state of our affairs in Mexico have certainly revealed a rather truckling and subservient policy on the part of Her Majesty's Government. They have allowed England to be made a catspaw of by the French Emperor, as they also did to some extent in China. We have now, however, withdrawn our neck from the noose, and we trust that during the recess, that period so fatal to Lord Russell, we shall not be drawn into it again. But the mistakes we may have committed in Mexico shrink into insignificance by the side of the terrible responsibilities we are now incurring in China. In a debate which took place in the House of Commons on the 8th of last month it was elicited that we had pledged ourselves to obligations of the most arduous and extensive nature. We are to assist Prince Kung in putting down the Taepings; we are to collect his revenue,

remodel his army and navy, and supply him with European officers. It was by these very steps that our factories at Calcutta and Madras expanded into a vast empire. *Sic India crevit.* Are we to repeat the process in China, and have another Asiatic possession to conquer, to govern, and to pay for? Such were the questions very obviously suggested by the last debate upon the subject; questions that were by no means rendered less alarming by the replies of Mr. Layard and Lord Palmerston.

Various discussions have taken place from time to time on the affairs of Italy, of Turkey, and of Poland; but beyond the announcement by Mr. Layard, on the 14th of March, that Turkey was steadily progressing, both socially, politically, and financially, the debates contained little of importance. A more important point in connection with foreign affairs was raised by Mr. Horsfall, who, on the 11th of March, revived the proposal of adopting the other half of the principle of which the one half was conceded in 1856. We then, for the first time, agreed that a neutral flag should make neutral goods, such neutral goods being not contraband of war. Since then it has often been contended that we should complete this step by allowing even hostile flags to carry private property unmolested. Such was the gist of Mr. Horsfall's resolution; and we do not know that it would be wholly unwise to adopt it. Almost all the advantage which our naval superiority gave to us was thrown away at the Treaty of Paris. Because, of course, while we could seize neutral vessels carrying hostile cargoes, we drove all neutral Powers to employ English shipping, and so became the carriers of the world. But now this advantage would fall to some neutral Power liable to capture by neither side. The House, however, refused to entertain the proposal, though Lord Palmerston was obliged to promise that he would give it his serious consideration.

The Financial condition of India, the Canadian Militia Bill, the Jamaica Loan Bill, and the general subjects of Colonial fortification, and Colonial expenditure, form the remaining topics of the session. The three first of these are eminently unsatisfactory. All Mr. Laing's boasted financial skill seems to have produced nothing, or worse than nothing; that is, the most hopeless confusion in the mind of Sir Charles Wood. All we find out with certainty is that a deficit still exists, and that it is only "expected to disappear at the close of the current year." The rejection by the Canadian Parliament of the Bill for embodying the Canadian Militia has been discussed in both Houses, and is, we fear, an ominous symptom. It certainly forms a curious comment on the debates of the 4th and 21st of March, on the former of which Mr. A. Mills proposed that "colonies exercising the rights of self-government ought to take the main responsibility of providing for their own security," while on the latter it was proposed by Mr. Baxter that "the cost of fortifications in a self-governed country was not a proper charge on the imperial treasury." These motions, as things stood, were both withdrawn; but if Canada perseveres in her intention, public opinion on the subject will rapidly undergo a change. The Jamaica Loan Bill consists simply in the renunciation, with as good a grace as we can assume, of a debt

owing to us by the Jamaica Legislature. The money was originally lent to put down a negro insurrection, and now that the coloured race have got a majority in the assembly they refuse to pay a penny. It appears that it can't be helped, and so we must even make the best of it.

Such is the outline of a session which, if not strikingly eventful, will long be remembered in connection with great events abroad, and with the wonderful rally of the Conservative party at home, which has, for almost the first time in our annals, placed Parliament in the singular position of being governed by "Her Majesty's Opposition."

Austria and Hungary.



WHEN, at the beginning of the present year, men were forecasting the chances of tranquillity or disturbance on the continent of Europe, the country which the general apprehension pointed out as likely above all others to be the scene of disquietude and tumult, if not of actual war, was Austria. The new kingdom which had recently sprung up in its south-western frontier made no secret of its desire to extend its dominions at the expense of the ancient empire of the Cæsars. Its most extensive and important province threatened it with revolt. Neither danger has as yet been realized. On the one side the Italians have shown such a want of genius for government, and of administrative capacity, and are still so embarrassed by their own divisions, as well as by the French occupation of Rome, that the danger of any aggression on their part is manifestly far more remote than it seemed a year ago. So remote, indeed, if we also take into consideration the great difficulties, civil as well as military, which it would have to encounter, that we may for the present dismiss it from our consideration altogether, with the single remark that the cry of Italy for the Italians, plausible as it is, and carrying, as it does, to the minds of many all the force of a logical demonstration, will no more give them Venetia than it will give them Yorkshire; since by far the greater part of Venetia is wholly alien to Italy. Some of its districts are peopled by Swiss; many by Germans. Some of its tribes are even Slavonians; comparatively few can boast even the slightest mixture of Italian blood.

The danger arising from the attitude assumed by Hungary is more serious, not only because internal rebellion is at all times a greater evil than the most formidable foreign aggression, but also because the discontented spirit in that great province being already existent and rampant, has a natural tendency to gain strength by continuance: yet, however specious and attractive the arguments put forward by Hungary may be, it is not difficult for bystanders to see that no people have ever had less cause for the suspicious discontent to which they have abandoned themselves, or for the peremptory rejection of their Sovereign's proposals than the Hungarians. It is now nearly a year and a-half ago since the Emperor, by a solemn and irrevocable deed, not only restored her former constitution to Hungary, but

granted to the whole empire a parliamentary government based on principles not very dissimilar to those which are the foundation of our own liberties; and that these principles have, as they were intended by the Emperor and his wise and honest counsellors to have, a practical reality, is sufficiently proved by the subsequent action of the Diet assembled under the provisions of this new constitution, which has not only discussed the various propositions submitted to it by the ministers of the crown with a liberal independence of spirit, but has even rejected some, which, as being financial measures, are naturally those which the ministry must have considered as of the greatest importance, without eliciting the least expression of displeasure from those in authority. The Reichsrath is clearly a powerful and independent body; if not yet to the full as independent as our own parliament, with all its privileges nearly two centuries old, far more so than that parliament was in its days of infancy; more fearless than that parliament was in the days of the Stuarts; more free from intrigue and corruption than it was under William or Anne, or even under the two first Georges. Yet to this noble assembly Hungary obstinately refuses to send members, and claims a Diet of her own, to sit in feeble isolation at Pesth, while the greater assembly is holding its councils at Vienna. One would think those who prompt this refusal were not only ignorant of the history of other nations, but forgetful of their own. Do they forget how sternly and how steadily the leaders of the Hungarians have before now refuted the claims of the diet of Agram to be independent of their diet at Pesth; yet, what reason can they give for refusing to the Croats and Slavonians a privilege parallel to that which they now claim from the main empire? Or if the claim of those provinces was unreasonable, how can theirs be reasonable?

Or again, do they forget how long they pertinaciously withstood the substitution of an hereditary for an elective sovereignty; while the increase of tranquillity and prosperity which they have enjoyed since that great constitutional change, as compared with the earlier period of their history, is too great and too manifest to be denied? And may they not from that example legitimately infer that the union with the central government to which they are now invited, which is but another change in precisely the same direction, will also be the parent of a still further augmentation of those blessings?

Or, if they prefer learning from the experience of other nations, can they not see, in the inconceivable improvement which has taken place in the condition of Scotland and Ireland since the completion of their incorporation with England by their respective unions, reason to think that a similar union of their own country with Austria will similarly tend to the advance of their province in every circumstance of welfare that depends upon human legislation? Some of the demagogues, or even of the mistaken patriots of Hungary will reply, as if it were a sufficient answer, or any answer at all to these arguments, that Austria only invites them to this union in order to strengthen herself, not them; and that our support of Austria is but selfish, because it is our interest to see Austria strong. We will examine this answer in both its parts. No

doubt a complete union with Hungary, such as is proposed, will strengthen Austria, but in so doing it will strengthen Hungary in the very same or even a greater degree: for, in the very nature of things, the greatness of the province must depend upon the greatness of the entire empire far more than the prosperity of the main empire depends upon the prosperity of any single province, however important. At the time of the Scotch and Irish unions both these measures were of vital necessity to England; they have been of incalculable benefit to her, as enabling her to maintain a leading place among the first-class empires of Europe: nevertheless, indispensable as they are to her, she has never derived from them half the benefit which has flowed in from them to the sister kingdoms, in internal civilization, in extension of trade and commerce, in all the luxuries and refinement of life, in general estimation, and influence, and renown. And so, in this instance, if Austria gains much, Hungary will gain more. Nor is there any danger (though the possibility of such a danger has also been employed as an argument) that the Hungarians will be outvoted, and so their influence be neutralized in a Diet of the whole empire. She is too large a province to be liable to such a fate; on the contrary, judging once more from what has happened in our own country, we should infer that the probability was far greater that the Hungarian deputies would acquire a too preponderating influence, and not only outweigh the authority of any other single province, but would often be able to give, as it were, a casting-vote between rival parties, and thus, in effect, hold in their hands the ultimate destinies of the empire.

To come to the second part of the answer, that our arguments are selfish, because for our own objects we desire that Austria should be strong; we admit that we do desire it, but we deny that we are selfish in so regarding the question. Austria is the natural ally of England. There are no two nations in the world which have fewer adverse or jarring interests; none which can assist each other in more various or important points: while, to take a larger view of the case, the greatness of Austria, as a counterpoise to the power of France and Russia, is indispensable to the permanence of peace in Europe. It is, therefore, chiefly as eager lovers of peace (and surely that is a feeling which can hardly be called selfish) that we are eager for the greatness and solidity of the power of Austria. But, even supposing that the motive which actuates us were less pure, is it an objection to a line of policy that it would command the approval and support of Great Britain? We flatter ourselves that no nation will say this; we will go further and say that no nation does say this. And though we may not urge our long and tried friendship for Austria as a reason for pressing our opinion on this subject, since, while Hungary retains her present attitude of antagonism, that is not an argument to which she will listen, we may certainly adduce the position of our country as the birth-place, and hitherto the sole abode, of Constitutional freedom, as one which eminently entitles us to pronounce a judgment on a case like this. The voice of every statesman in England declares that the proposals and offers of Austria are conceived in a

frank and liberal spirit, and deserve to be accepted, because they will be beneficial to both parties. Even the party in Hungary most hostile to Austria shows that it is fully aware of the advantages of the alliance with us; but that alliance it can only have as a part of Austria. Moreover, if the approval, and friendship, and alliance of Great Britain be worth having, it is plain that the more powerful a State is the greater will be our temptation to cultivate and cherish an alliance with it. We wish, therefore, in the first place, that Austria should be strong for her own sake: in exact proportion as she is strong will be our inducement to wish that she should maintain that strength for our own. And, as the limbs are inseparable from the body, in desiring the greatness and prosperity of Austria, we desire the greatness and prosperity of all and each of her provinces, the most important of which, as we need not tell the Hungarians, is Hungary.

The Unification of Germany.

HALF-KIN as we are to the Prussians in blood, closely and happily allied as are the Royal families of the two countries, there is no State in Europe which more tries the temper of the British public. We do not, like some, look back seven or eight years, and remember against Prussia her neutrality during the Crimean war. On the contrary, we think she was quite justified in refusing to take part in that contest. She had nothing whatever to gain; and in similar circumstances England would have done just the same. Nor do we think of the "Macdonald affair;" although, thanks to the ridiculous bluster of the *Times* and Lord Palmerston, that very small matter made a louder noise in this country than all the objectionable parts of Prussian policy for the last ten years put together. It is since 1850 that the epoch of present importance begins. It is since then that the destinies of Germany have begun to shape themselves, and that those perils from without and strivings for unity within have arisen which every reflecting mind in this country cannot fail to watch with lively and ever-increasing interest.

Germany—we do not speak of the Courts, but of the people—longs for unity, or at least for a closer organization, such as is called for by the spirit of the times and the wants of the Fatherland. And it is to Prussia that the mass of the German nation has looked for the initiative in forwarding the popular desire. In 1848, when this desire first leapt up like a passion, the imperial crown of the Fatherland was within the grasp of the Prussian king. After coquetting and vacillating, he ended by refusing it; perhaps wisely. But again, in calmer and more moderate form, with more regard for established rights, and with a better discernment of the real difficulties of the case, the same desire, the same longing for a closer and better bond of union, pervades the German mind: again the Germans look to Prussia to take the initiative: and again, it is undeniable, a most grave responsibility lies upon the Prussian monarch and his councillors. The full extent of that responsibility, the immense dif-

ficulties which beset the action of the Prussian Government, are but imperfectly appreciated in this country; we have reason to doubt whether they are soberly realized by the majority of the Prussian representatives themselves.

The contest between the Chambers and the Government which has been going on for the last twelve months is important not so much from the actual votes at issue as from the tendency on either side which it reveals. The elections show that the great majority of the Prussian people desire that the Government should become wholly Constitutional, and that the King shall yield to the votes of the Chambers as thoroughly as is the case in England. And it must be said that the Prussian people pursue their object with infinite moderation. There is no fear of a revolution: their loyalty is perfect, their patience is most exemplary. They respect the frank, honest, upright soldier who is now their king: they seem to be aware of his inaptitude to accommodate himself to a new position: they adhere to their purpose, but they show no desire to push matters to an extremity. We wish, however, that we were as sure of their wisdom as of their loyalty. The great cause of contention between King and Chambers is the Budget. As usual in almost all such struggles between King and Parliament the question is, who is to hold the purse-strings? The Chambers demand that every part of the Budget shall be voted by them, and that the King shall not—as has been the case hitherto—supplement the supplies voted by the Chamber by "extraordinary credits" ordained of his own power. Clearly the Chambers are entitled to insist on this. The Emperor of Austria has frankly yielded up this part of his ancient prerogative. Following in his wake, the Emperor of the French has lately done the same. Prussia, in past times a more constitutional monarchy than either, cannot lag behind. But then, what is the point upon which "the party of progress" have chosen to raise this issue? The very one upon which the King, from his antecedents, was sure to be most obstinate; and one which, if Prussia does aspire to the leadership of Germany, needs to be handled very delicately. The question is as to reducing the cost of the military establishments. Like all old soldiers, the King feels keenly on this subject. That cannot be helped, even a king's susceptibilities cannot be respected against the wishes of a nation. But a graver consideration is, Is not the King right? Is he not right as regards the general safety of the Fatherland, not unmenaced on the Rhine? Is he not right, also, as regards the position which his people wish Prussia to assume in Germany? If Prussia is to take the initiative in obtaining the abolition of those party-walls which so long kept Germany cut up into a cumbrous congeries of petty States—if she is to demand a remodelling of the Confederation, on more popular principles and in more effective organization, has the Prussian Government the least chance of being listened to if she have not a due amount of power as well as of argument on her side? A strong policy requires a strong army. The Prussian Chambers desire the one but withhold the other. This cannot be. Either the Chambers should abandon their aspirations, and should cease to urge the Go-

vernment to measures of Federal reform, or else they should strengthen the executive proportionately to the difficulties which such a policy must necessarily create for it.

But the dilemma is double-faced. If it is impossible for the Chambers to expect the realization of the national desire that Prussia should come forward as the reformer and future leader of the Confederation if the necessary material power is withheld from the executive, it is equally impossible for Prussia to become the rallying power of German unity so long as the King refuses to adopt the first principle of a Constitutional Government. Here is the difficulty. It is hard for a foreigner to determine whether or not the taxation of Prussia is so heavy that a reduction of her armaments is absolutely indispensable. Judging by the case of England, we should say that it is not. And this much is remarkable; that whereas in England the general sentiment of the country supports the Government in its heavy expenditure for defensive purposes, a majority in the Prussian Chambers takes precisely the opposite course. And yet Prussia, and Germany at large, is far more menaced by the contingencies of the future than England is. Apart from the strict principle of Constitutional Government, therefore, the Prussian King and his Ministers appear to be unquestionably in the right; but from a Constitutional point of view they are still more certainly in the wrong. And unless Prussia become a thoroughly Constitutional State, it cannot become the rallying-point for Young Germany. The Chambers are right in seeking one thing, the King is right in seeking another: they cannot agree as to the means, yet the great object of each is the same. This is just one of those peculiarly Prussian dilemmas which Englishmen regard with so much vexation and weariness, not unmixed with contempt. If there is one requisite of practical statesmanship it is that rival parties, when they have one grand aim in common, should attach more importance to the attaining of that end than to the adoption of the particular measures which either party thinks best for the purpose. Instead of evading difficulties, the Prussians make a point of running their heads against them. And thus, while the King and the Parliament are equally desirous of promoting a certain line of national policy, they have contrived to place themselves in an attitude of almost insurmountable antagonism. Hence the Prussian deadlock—the political paralysis which weighs so perniciously upon the leading section of the Germanic race in one of the gravest crises of the history of the Fatherland.

The internal crisis would be trivial were it not for the condition of affairs without. The Germans, if slow and sluggish, have an invaluable stock of patience, and a rightmindedness which may safely be relied upon; so that, as long as their difficulties are purely domestic, no wellwisher need feel uneasy about them. The *gravamen* of the present dilemma is that they will not be let alone to work it to the solution they desire. If the Germans desire unity, France desires the frontier of the Rhine. And while the Germans seek after the former, the French will attempt to seize the latter. German unity—we do not mean a unity like that of England or France, but a unity which, while respecting the

federal principle, will ultimately do away with the petty Courts—is an idea which runs counter to so many interests that it is certain to meet with most formidable opposition. If Prussia aspires to the Hegemony of the united Fatherland, the project of unity will be strenuously opposed by Austria. And even if Prussia and Austria were agreed, there is a “third Germany,” as it is called, which would enter its dissent and offer its opposition. Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, besides the lesser States, will oppose to the uttermost any project for “mediatising” them, or for rendering them subordinate to Prussia; and probably they would rather side with a foreign Power than submit to be thus “improved off the face of the earth.”

Hence the danger without finds an ally within. For our own part, we almost despair of Germany accomplishing her unification until she have undergone some great calamity from without. And then, so far as regards the Rhine provinces, it will be too late. In truth, partly owing to the character of the German race, still more to the fact that an enemy watches them from without, the crisis in the Fatherland is enough to make any man despair. It is nonsense to exhort the Prussian king (as the *Times* has often done) to follow the policy of annexation so audaciously pursued by Sardinia. A policy of mingled intrigue, treachery, and violence—however much in place it may be in Italy—would never do amongst the honest Germans. The Power which tried it, instead of winning the leadership, would be branded with infamy, and treason against the Commonwealth of the Fatherland. We cannot presume to advise: we believe the wiser the man, the more he will recognize the gravity of the dilemma. But the danger is unmistakable. The Emperor of the French need be in no hurry: as long as no decisive step is taken to consolidate the power of Germany, he also can afford to wait. But whenever that step is taken, he trusts to league himself with the malcontent Princes of Germany, and to seize the German provinces of the Rhine. His ambition can wait upon Germany's; and in the turmoil which will attend the process of unification he counts surely upon attaining the frontier of the Rhine. The Prussian Government sees this, and hence its hesitation to advance as the “party of progress” desire; but we are not sure if the danger ahead is equally obvious to the majority in the Chamber of Deputies.

The Church Congress at Oxford.

WHAT is a Church Congress? The name and thing have risen upon the English world so suddenly, so naturally, with such an air of dignity (let men say what they will), so full-grown, that people are hardly found to ask themselves whether they had ever heard of a Church Congress a year ago. The two first of what will probably be a long annual series have both taken place within that time; the first was held at Cambridge last autumn, the second, at Oxford, has just dispersed. So that it is well to go back and ask our categorical question once more—What is

a Church Congress? If it is a new power for good or for evil, the youngest birth of that vigorous brood which re-invigorated Church feeling has of late years produced, it had better be stopped at once and asked what account it has to give of itself.

Those of our readers who attended the late Congress at Oxford—and we really pity those who did not—will remember well that the Bishop of Oxford, as President, laid down its position clearly enough. We have here an authoritative guide. He spoke not only his own sentiments, but those expressed deliberately at the similar meeting held at Cambridge, as well as those put forth in the circulars of invitation issued by the Oxford Committee. The Congress was not an assembly which could in any way pretend to rival, or supersede, or interfere with, Convocation. Still less could it pretend to be a constituted Synod of any sort or kind. There could be no voting, no expression of any opinion as the voice of the Congress. Any man whatever (willing to pay five shillings) who could claim to be a member of the Church of England, be he bishop, priest, or deacon, clerk or layman, communicant or non-communicant, representative of a constituted or not-constituted association, or no representative at all, might find his place, and be for the time on an equality with his next neighbour. It was a mere assembly for discussion, for ventilation of ideas, for mutual encouragement, for bringing clergy and laity into contact with one another, for that harmonizing of discordant elements which, in so many cases, is effected at once by bringing the estranged face to face and asking them to shake hands in the midst of the common danger. This was the fundamental idea; this, it must be admitted, has been kept in view throughout. Both Congresses have been experimental; the second, as was natural, on a larger scale, and much further developed than the first; nor can the experiment even yet be said to be more than commenced: but some guidance will be gained for the future by a fair consideration of what has been effected on the late occasion, the dangers which have been avoided, and those which are still to be feared.

That the object of these gatherings should have been so generally understood as to have brought together at the first attempt, and after a very short notice, some three hundred, and at the second some nine hundred persons, from the most distant parts of the country, this number including a large proportion of delegates from Church Associations of different kinds, is in itself a clear sign that the idea was suitable to the wants of the Church. That so large a proportion of the laity (larger, we believe, in comparison with the clergy at Cambridge than at Oxford) should have seized the opportunity of making themselves felt and heard in these Conferences is true matter of congratulation to those who have of late years awoke to the fact that the Church does not consist of clergy alone, and, in the perils which beset her, that she has no chance unless she can rally round her faithful laity. That persons of such opposite views as were assembled at Oxford could meet and part harmoniously, that High Church and Low Church, extremes and moderates of both parties, could join in any common discussion of matters which, as they cut

deeper into men's feelings and consciences than subjects of mere temporal interest, are therefore apt and almost certain to excite warmth and often bitterness, is a triumph of no common order. Not but that the Congress had its share of dangers on this score; but they were happily evaded, under God's Providence, by the good sense of the members, and, it must be said, by the wonderful tact and sagacity of the President.

Some extreme views were expressed; for instance, by one or two respected speakers on the desirableness of vows in sisterhoods: but though listened to for the most part with respectful silence, the speakers being evidently cheered on rising merely for their personal qualities, the general consent of the Congress was most unmistakably given to the President's protest against those views. And when, the next day, an attempt was made to give effect to a still further protest of the same sort, on the part of a large number of influential persons, it was ruled that the essential nature of the Congress forbade any voting or binding of its members; but there was no room to doubt the general feeling in favour of the substance of the protest. This particular case may be taken as a type of the rest. Any extreme view—and there were but few such—was either received with expressive silence or immediately exposed, amidst general cheering, by some subsequent speakers. If a decided bore, who had evidently nothing to say, took up the valuable and too short time of the Congress beyond the limits assigned by the patience of its almost too patient members, he met at last with a steady and decided quietus. In short, the discussions assumed exactly that character which the English alone, by tradition and education, know how to give—a free, fair, open, manly, and vigorous character. There were not many great orators, and it was well perhaps there were not, for all superabundant speech must have been ruthlessly sheared away by the necessary limitation to ten minutes. But this limitation had a very wholesome effect. Any one who has in reality anything to say can say it in that time; and where many have to speak and ought to speak, no other rule could ensure a fair hearing to a sufficient number. The confusion above referred to, where protests arose on a subsequent day, may be traced, indeed, entirely to the infraction of the rule of time (through the fault of the members themselves), which indulgence prevented those from being heard who were ready, but for the lateness of the hour, to refute what had been said by one who had been improperly allowed to occupy more than the allotted period. This will be a guide to future Congresses.

Then amidst the successes of the Congress must be reckoned the very practical nature of the papers and discussions. Such was the main feature of the proposed scheme, and it stands out as the prominent result. Every subject was chosen with reference to some action that it was either very pressingly necessary to take at once, or on which some doubtful action had been taken, and therefore required to be discussed. Illustration of this remark will not be needed for those who have watched in ever so slight a degree, whether present or not, the proceedings of which we are writing. The slightest notice will be

enough by way of reminder. Thus the supply and education of the clergy have been matter of anxious thought to all who care about the Church. The rise of theological colleges is a new phenomenon. The hold on clerical education formerly monopolised by the universities is slipping away. How are the latter to retain any hold at all on it? How are university-bred men to be obtained for the ministry? How can modern substitutes for such training be improved? How can the great middle-class be utilized for the purposes of the ministry? Can lay agency be brought into operation without danger? Can we learn anything from primitive times which may help us in our need? If the Congress has not answered all these questions, it has at least cleared the ground very materially. Some of the best heads in the kingdom have given the result of a good deal of thought about them. We are much mistaken if the universities have not received an effective impulse, and we suspect the discussion will not be thrown away on the bishops and their chaplains; above all we believe that the efforts which have been made of late in isolated directions to penetrate the great middle-class phalanx have by this Congress received an amount of consolidation and encouragement which will not be long in making itself felt.

The increase of the episcopate, or rather, as Mr. Beresford Hope rightly insisted on phrasing it, the extension of the diocesan system, was a subject which of all others was peculiarly fitted for such a meeting as the Congress. It is one upon which it is very difficult to move people. There is not Church feeling enough in the House of Commons and too much Church-dignitary feeling in the House of Lords to give it a fair chance in Parliament. The Ecclesiastical Commission stinks in the nostrils of the British people. The people themselves require teaching on the subject. From ages of neglect and abuse they have almost lost the primitive idea of a working, confirming, constantly seen-and-felt bishop. Every great meeting of well-informed Churchmen must therefore bring the subject before the eyes of the public. It could scarcely be said to be discussed either at Oxford or Cambridge, and therefore it ought not to be omitted when a Congress meets again.

What, again, could be more practical than the question of the offertory and its kindred question of free churches? Though already past the stage, as Mr. Claughton in his admirable paper truly remarked, of being dealt with as a party move, it takes much talking and much proving to introduce the former of these practices at all widely. In proportion to those cases where it does not exist, the number where it does is still painfully minute. And as to free churches, the principle, though advocated entirely for town populations, was sufficiently attacked even in the Oxford Congress to show that it has still a hard battle to fight.

We have referred already to one of the most prominent subjects of our times which so deeply excited the interests of the Congress. How much better that any half-avowed or concealed views and plans on so practical a matter as women's work has now become should be brought to light and placed before the public, than that they should smoulder

on, causing suspicion, distrust, and hindrance at the very threshold where every obstacle requires the most painstaking removal. And the practical development of such good work in workhouses and hospitals was perhaps in still stricter keeping with the objects of the meeting, while the institutions of deaconesses, already making their appearance in different parts of the country, required only to be described by their originators to carry the enthusiastic approval of all who heard.

There seems, indeed, to have been great success in obtaining writers and speakers who had themselves dealt practically with that of which they wrote or spoke. Thus, in giving the history of synodal action in the colonies, who were more fitted to describe it and point its lessons for the guidance of England than the bishops who had safely and wisely superintended the navigation of their synods through all the perils incident to Tasmanian and South African society. Who more fitted to speak of the Church of England on the Continent than Mr. Meyrick, the founder of the Anglo-Continental Society? Who more capable of giving good advice—and most excellent advice it was—on the delicate subject of promoting the legitimate influence of the Church in the House of Commons than that faithful member of it, Mr. Napier, a man to whom so much is owing for past assistance in that House as well as for his hearty co-operation in the Oxford Congress? Who so fitted to give advice to the clergy on a sound management of the finances of the Church as the munificent Mr. Hubbard, who has so often suffered by their mismanagement? Who had more right to speak of school-chapels than those who have successfully worked them like Mr. Cadman? or on the training of missionaries than Messrs. Philipps and Goldie, who are hard at that work? or on young men's institutes than Mr. Lawrell, who has done more than most men with that all-important class of our people?

In all these cases and many more the facts display a result very far removed from the empty talk and theorizing which the Church's enemies have most unmeaningly attributed to the Congress. Indeed, the evidently affected character of the sneers with which the mere world has honoured all mention of the gathering are the best monument of its importance. Something more has been done than men like to own; something more really likely to tell on the national polity than is convenient. Be it so. Let each go its own way. We are perhaps on the eve of greater things for our Church than some imagine.

In the mean time let the practical men of the North, who have earned a right, by sending so many of their best men to the late Congress, to follow next in order after the old Universities, try if they cannot make some still further improvements. Oxford had fewer papers and more discussion than Cambridge. Let Manchester have fewer papers still. It is unsatisfactory to sit three hours and feel at the end that the subject is not half talked out. Let it press upon more associations the necessity of sending delegates, and of very carefully picking out their best men for that purpose. And while the more modern Church Defence Associations are invited to avail themselves of this oppor-

tunity for conference, let the older Societies, which, in various departments, are doing the Church's work, be urged to provide themselves on the next occasion with agents who shall on their behalf watch the proceedings of the Congress, observe the pulse of the Church, and measure the requirements of our times. Let the men of Manchester be at least equally careful with their predecessors in selecting subjects and writers. But above all, while they improve on their model, as they doubtless will improve, let them take the utmost pains to preserve the exact nature of the Congress, as it has been hitherto understood, not admitting doctrinal nor impractical matters into their list of subjects, nor invading the province of Convocation or Synods, but keeping clear from all misconception the one broad characteristic of a meeting of members of the Church of England, bound by being such to preserve her status and her traditions, and assembled to discuss the best means of promoting her efficiency.

The Committee of the National Society.

HE Editor has received a printed letter from the office of the National Society enclosed to him by order of the Committee, as the second of Mr. Mayow's amendment, by the Rev. the Secretary. He publishes that letter with his reply.

In a correspondence with Canon Trevor, published in the Guardian of the 16th instant, the Secretary repeats the demurrer as made by him to the statement of the Editor at the annual meeting, June 5—that it is the memorandum of July 23, 1860, which has done more than anything else to strengthen the hands of the Committee of Council in imposing "Conscience Clauses" on Church schools—and rests his demurrer on the fact that the Committee of the Society had been in communication with the Committee of Council on the subject of "Conscience Clauses" previously to July 23, 1860. What the demurrer has to do with the statement the Editor is unable to perceive.

The Editor leaves it to Mr. Mayow to expose the misrepresentation of the purpose of his amendment, which is contained in the concluding letter of the Rev. the Secretary, bearing date June 30, 1862, as published in the Trevor correspondence.

Letter on the Subject of the National Society's Terms of Union.

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S OFFICE,
Sanctuary, Westminster,
July 7th, 1862.

REVEREND SIR,

THE following Amendment to a Resolution at the last Annual Meeting of this Society, on June 5th, was moved and seconded, and was withdrawn on the understanding that it should be submitted to the Committee of the Society:—

"That, in order to give weight to any representations which the Committee of the National Society may make to the Committee of Council on Education as to the Revised Code, it is necessary that the Memorandum of the Committee of the National Society, bearing date July 23rd, 1860, and the Letter of the Rev. the Secretary to the Rev. H. A. Olivier, bearing date December 5th, 1860, by which it appears that the National Society holds it incompatible with its institution to admit into Union schools which are so constituted by their trust-deed as to require them to teach all children the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy of the Church of England, be re-considered and amended."

The Committee, having carefully considered the above Amendment, do not deem it desirable to revise the documents referred to therein; or to impose restrictions, in the degree suggested by the promoters of that motion, on the discretion of the clergyman, subject to it is, in case of a difference between the Clergy and Managers, to appeal to the Bishop of the Diocese. On the contrary, the Committee are persuaded that, by the judicious exercise of that discretion, the largest amount of education in the principles of the Church will be obtained.

At the same time the Committee would remark that there is no objection on their part to the insertion by the promoters of any National School of the very words of the terms of union in the trust-deed.

I have the honour to be, Rev. Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN G. LONSDALE, Secretary.

The Rev. M. W. MAYOW.

(Copy.)

East Brent, Weston s. Mar,
July 15th, 1862.

REVEREND SIR,

I BEG to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th instant, with its printed enclosure.

I am sorry to be compelled to say that the printed letter containing the decision of the Committee is, in my judgment, wholly satisfactory.

The question is not about the insertion by a founder or founder promoter or promoters of "the very words of the terms of union in the trust-deed"—this is, of course, as it has always been, competent to all founders or promoters to do for themselves—but in what manner and with what purpose such insertion is made. That is to say, whether it is made as ascertaining and fixing the purpose of founder promoters that their schools shall be *for ever* for those children who shall be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy, inasmuch as such founders or promoters are persuaded in their conscience in this is the primary and natural sense of what is meant by "the Church;" or, whether it is made subject to the Memorandum of July 23, 1860, and the Letter of December 5, 1860, which exclude the sense, and, therefore, exclude from Union every school founded in this sense.

Every other school which can be taken as coming within the scope of the Society is admitted into Union freely; and against such admission I have nothing to say. The school which is held in the conscience of its founders or promoters to be a Church of England school, in the primary and natural sense of the words, is the only school excluded from Union; and against such exclusion I have everything to say.

It is then difficult to understand what redress of the grievance of conscience complained of, as inflicted by the Memorandum of July 23, 1860, and the Letter of December 5, 1860, the Committee suppose themselves to have given by the statement that "there is no objection, on their part, to the insertion, by the promoters of any national school, of the very words of the terms of 'Union in the trust-deed,' except with the refusal of the Committee to revise the Memorandum of July 23, 1860, and the Letter of Dec. 5, 1860." Because, so long as these are adhered to, it is only to confuse men's minds and to deceive men's minds to insert into the trust-deed, as admitting of only one sense, words which cannot be taken in that sense, but may be taken in any other.

The whole question is not a question of results, but of truth and justice, if there can be any true distinction in such a matter between results and truth and justice, which there cannot be: and I do not doubt that very many members of the Society who do not think of me about the constitution and conduct of a Church of England school agree with me entirely that there is neither truth nor justice in the parts of the Memorandum of July 23, 1860, and of the Letter of Dec. 5, 1860, which are the subject of complaint.

It is a strange regard for "conscience," which respects the conscience of those who can found, or promote, or conduct a school of the Church of England on the comprehensive system, but does not respect the conscience of those who cannot.

It is a curious way of "educating the poor in the principles of the Established Church" which reaches that education by an indirect rather than a direct, process—precisely rather than certainly—accidentally rather than necessarily.

It is a new way of vindicating and maintaining dogmatic teaching—without which there is no religion—to select, as fitting subject for stigma and hindrance and exclusion, those who do not know what "education in the principles of the Established Church" means, except as based throughout upon the dogmatic teaching of the Established Church.

I am, Reverend Sir,
Faithfully yours,
(Signed) GEORGE A. DENISON.

The Rev. the Secretary of the
National Society.

P. S. I beg to add that I propose to make public the printed letter with this reply.

The Wesleyan Conference Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Liberation Society, and the Bicentenary.

WE have received a letter from the Wesleyan Conference office repudiating all connection, on the part of the "Old Methodist Body," with the Bicentenary Commemoration. The writer says:—"No member of ours, so far as I know, has joined in this mischievous crusade."

We are happy and thankful to have this assurance.

We have received another letter from an eminent Congregationalist, finding fault with us for representing the Bicentenary as the offspring of the Liberation Society, and claiming its parentage for "the Congregational Union at its meetings in Birmingham in October last, or rather for Mr. Binney in the preface to his book on Australia." In a second letter he says that the Secretary of the Liberation Society writes to him:—"After a careful consideration of the whole question in Committee the decision was arrived at that the questions involved in the Bicentenary Commemoration were not such as the Society could touch."

With these religious and political disclaimers we leave the matter. It is honest in the Congregationalists to assert their exclusive claim, the more so because the thing claimed is certainly not a hopeful child.

Bishop Mackenzie.

A FIGURE has disappeared from the Church's battle-field which must not be permitted to pass away without notice. For the sake of the office which he held, as well as for his own sake, the Church's obituary of this month should chronicle the name of Bishop Mackenzie.

Born of a good Scotch family, he found his way, after the ordinary course of a liberal education, to the University of Cambridge. There amongst his fellows few secured a stronger hold than he upon the affection of his cotemporary academics. He set himself, moreover, heartily to the proper studies of the place and came out at the close of his undergraduate course amongst the very first who obtained the highest mathematical honours of the University, appearing second only in the list of Wranglers in 1848. All that Cambridge could offer lay now open before him. He was elected a fellow of Caius College, and enjoyed the highest reputation for character and talent. What the attractions of such a position are none who have not felt them can conceive. The freedom and aciness of that society of literary equals, the speculations and the contests and the triumphs, and the harmony in contests, which stamps it with its own peculiar character, make it most specially alluring. There, too, is the sweetest incense of intellectual admiration burned the most fragrantly and the

most copiously before the successful student. But a voice had reached the inner ear of Charles Frederick Mackenzie which sounded sweeter to him than all these Syren Songs.

We believe that it was Bishop Selwyn's last visit to Cambridge, and the sermons which he then preached before the University which first turned practically Mackenzie's mind to missionary work. Other addresses from honoured lips fixed the hovering purpose, and he resolved that as the Church's work at home would find many labourers compared with the few who could or would prove her Catholic lineage by spreading the Gospel committed to her through the earth, that he would hold himself ready, whenever the call came, to join himself to the noble band whom of late years the Church of England has sent forth to plant the Faith in its purity of doctrine and discipline throughout the world.

It was not long before the call came. The Bishop (Colenso) of Natal (a distinguished member of his own University, and who had listened to the same voice and had entered on the same work) invited him, in 1854, to undertake the office of the first Archdeacon of S. Peter Manlyburg, in the Diocese of Natal. With Bishop Colenso he first visited the Cape and cast in his lot with the South African Church. There he continued for four years of active work, and learned much both of the manners and customs of the tribes of Southern Africa. In 1859 he was again in England, in consequence of an offer which had been made to him of more immediate missionary work than his Archdeaconry in Natal afforded him.

The years 1858 and 1859 were great years for Africa in connection with the Church of England. In December, 1856, Dr. Livingstone had returned home after his first sixteen years of wanderings and discoveries in Africa. In December, 1857, he delivered his lectures in the Senate House of Cambridge, and before his quitting England in March, 1858, he had visited Oxford also, to press upon the two Universities the duty of making some vigorous movement in behalf of the oppressed land of his adoption. Great was the effect of the simple, earnest, and heart-stirring words spoken, with his own northern pronunciation still strong upon him, by the noble-hearted traveller. But, like many other such appeals, they might have been barren of results had not the noble Bishop (Gray) of Cape-town (to whom a hundred years hence the Church will better know than she does now how much she owes) visited Cambridge in November, 1858, and stirred the dying embers to a flame. Within three weeks from his visit a committee was formed at Cambridge to carry out Livingstone's suggestions, and follow his exploring steps with a Mission of our Church to be sent forth by our Universities. In the following March, 1859, Oxford, accepting the sisterly invitation of Cambridge, joined in the attempt, and formed a committee under the presidency of the late beloved Dr. Williams, the Warden of New College.

Then came the two great meetings of the two Universities, that at Oxford on the 17th of May, that at Cambridge on the 1st of November, 1859. At these the mission was resolved on, and on the

day following the second, by universal acclamation, its conduct was committed to Archdeacon Mackenzie, with the resolution of seeking to place him over it as a missionary bishop. He, with the simple and courageous earnestness by which his character was so strongly marked, accepted, without hesitation, the dangerous dignity, and, as head of the mission, began to raise the funds needful for its maintenance. In this work he visited with the utmost diligence most parts of England, hastening, if it might be, to carry out in that very year his distant mission. On the difficulties which delayed his consecration at home we shall not here speak, because the subject is far too important to be noticed incidentally. It is one which the liberties and the efficiency of the Church of England alike require to be thoroughly dealt with; and looking at those who are committed to such a dealing with it, we cannot doubt that such a sifting it will ere long receive. To prevent delay a compromise was effected, under the terms of which the Archdeacon was sent out to Capetown, with a recommendation from the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury to the bishop of Capetown and his suffragans to consecrate him bishop for missionary service in the Zambesi district.

With this mission the Archdeacon sailed from Plymouth on the 6th of October, having on the 2nd met at the metropolitan church of Canterbury a farewell gathering of the English Church, than which we venture to say a nobler had never filled those venerable walls from the days of Augustine himself.

On the 1st of January, 1861, Mackenzie was consecrated to his high office by the metropolitan of Capetown, and the Bishops of Natal and S. Helena, and on the 8th he embarked on board the steamboat *Lyra* for the scene of his labours and his death. We shall not enter upon the detail of these, because the Central African Mission has just published an account of them full of the deepest interest, and which we recommend to the perusal of our readers.

Suffice it to say that he reached the highland range which Livingstone had pointed out as fit for European life; that he planted there the standard of the Cross; that around it at once broke out the fierce antagonism of the accursed Slave Trade to the Gospel of man's freedom; that a number of delivered captives formed the first trophy of the Cross, and the first nucleus of a population through whom hereafter the Gospel may be preached to all the neighbouring tribes; that for the time the Slave Trade is extinguished all around the Mission: that in the encounters to which this gave birth the Bishop took personally an active share. For this he has already been very severely censured. We are disposed ourselves to think that, at all events, in going beyond the very strictest line of defensive operations, to secure those who had entrusted themselves to him, he committed a grave error in judgment. But we cannot forget how easy it is, in the security of home, and in the calmness of a critical retrospect, to censure acts only half seen, and the motives for which we scarcely know; whilst those who were plunged in them were led on step by step, hardly knowing

where to stop in a course which began in peaceably depriving the manstealer of his prey, and then advanced along what to the actors seemed to be the inevitable course of a righteous resistance to intolerable wrong.

At this momentous crisis of the Mission, with which his name will be for ever identified, his life was lost through what man's imperfect language styles an accident. The oversetting of a canoe, the loss of all necessary medicines, and the daring spirit which would not appreciate the inevitable danger of tarrying, even so, to widen the basis of his missionary labours, brought on in its strength the fever which recent discoveries have taught us how to baffle; and on the distant island of the Shiri, repeating words of calm Christian hope, so long as his tongue could frame or his failing brain dictate articulate sounds, fell asleep in Jesus the first English bishop of the Shiri river in Africa, Charles Frederick Mackenzie. These are perhaps the last entries on paper, stained everywhere by the water of the river, from the island where he died:—"I have my hopes in my own mind that our being here in this way may be intended to prepare this village for being one of the stations to be worked by our missionary steamers (the university boat), for which I hope to write by this mail. So matters stand at present. Business is very low, and we have no quinine, which we ought to be taking every day. But He who brought us here can take care of us without human means. If we should both be down at once Charley (the native) will take care of us. The texts in Greek which we have learned day by day have been . . . Rom. viii 38, 39:—"I am persuaded, that neither death, &c. shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Good-bye for the present. How blessed a farewell!"

He was a man of great abilities, of a most singular simplicity of mind, of a most gentle and loving temper, with a purpose of the most entire resolution when it had been absolutely formed. When he left Cambridge, one of its greatest sons pronounced on him the sorrowing eulogy that never had he with so much regret parted for missionary work with any son of the University. He went on his errand of love in the most ungrudging spirit of self-sacrifice. It was at Cuddesdon Palace that he was invested with the office of Archdeacon to the distant Colony of Natal. Six years later he left it again to venture all for Christ on the yet more distant Zambesi; and before going he wrote out as his remembrance the words, "The Lord is at hand, be careful for nothing." They were the simple utterance of his soul, and they were soon fulfilled in their utmost sense. His body rests beside the African river. Heavily its fever-loaded mists settle down at night-fall and dawn on that distant grave. But he has left behind him a track of burning light. His works do follow him, and his Lord, ever near at hand, has taken to His own rest His faithful confessor.



Musical Development.



It has been often stated, and we think justly, that the English people have become of late years more musical than they were in the former part of this century. Certainly, if we may judge from the number of choral societies and harmonic associations which have arisen all over the country, we shall be strongly induced to agree in this opinion. Moreover, it is also unquestionably true that as a nation we can do justice to, and duly appreciate, the compositions of the great masters of the art of sweet sounds to a much greater extent than any other people, excepting only the Germans. And not only is this improvement in our national taste apparent in the case of secular music, it is also very marked in that of the music of the Church. In fact, there is now going on a sort of musical Church-revival, as is evinced by the many choral festivals which are now almost of every-day occurrence, and more especially still by the various diocesan choral associations which have begun to exercise so beneficial an influence on the music of our parish churches. The number of churches in which choral service has been adopted, either wholly or in part, during the last ten years, is indeed wonderfully great, as compared with what was the case at any other period since the Reformation; and to all who duly value music as a handmaid to devotion, and as an important part of our National Church service, the musical aspect of our parochial churches is most cheering.

When, however, we turn to our *cathedrals*, where the most perfect models of choral service should be found, we must, alas! in the majority of cases, be struck with the conviction that they have not kept pace with the general musical advance of the day. Now with whom does the fault lie? How can the evil alluded to be best corrected? Who are the persons to set the reform going? What hope is there of a satisfactory result? These questions, and others like them, can best be answered by showing not only what a cathedral service *ought* to be, but also in what respects it falls short of the proper standard. Now, it is probable that not a tithe of those who frequent our cathedrals have a just idea of what they ought to expect. Some prefer such a service simply because they are fond of music, and like to have their ears tickled. Some like it from association, or because they admire the architecture of the building, or because they like the preaching, or because they can be seated comfortably. But comparatively few come in order to have their devotions quickened, their attention riveted, their interest sustained, their thoughts ennobled and elevated, by the sublimity and solemnity of the sacred strains they hear: and yet that is in truth the real and true advantage—and a most unspeakably great advantage it is—which is derivable from the cathedral service, when it is performed as it ought to be. And it seems as though the general ignorance of this, which so unfortunately prevails among our cathedral congregations, were the chief cause of the flimsy and degraded style of music which is so frequently substituted for the genuine solid compositions of our grand old Church writers; for the persons who select the music to be performed, knowing what is expected and preferred by those who form their congregation, choose such as will gratify the ear simply, rather than study to select only that which will conduce best to the glory of God and the edification of the worshippers. Thus does the evil react on itself.

If prettiness were to give way to sublimity, and sprightliness to solemnity, then indeed those who only come to have their ears tickled might perhaps complain; but, on the other hand, those who really come for devotional purposes would really get what they are in search of; and assuredly they are the persons who best deserve our consideration, for they seek to worship, while the former seek a concert:—these love Church music as a means to the

noblest of ends, while those merely affect it from, at best, a purely artistic point of view, as if it were the *end*, not the *means*; and that too in a very unsatisfactory and unwholesome manner. Besides, sublime and solemn music, if judiciously introduced, would, in the end, be appreciated by a large number of those who are now unable to comprehend it (for in many instances merely the habit of hearing it is wanting); and who can tell what a good effect might be wrought on the character of the devotions of such persons, when once they had really felt the true influence of the highest species of sacred song? Sublimity is the highest walk of every art, and pre-eminently of music. Our cathedrals ought to set forth the highest and best models. Therefore sublimity should be the leading characteristic of the music chosen to adorn the service within their walls.

But let it not be supposed that because sublimity should be the leading feature of cathedral music therefore beauty and variety need be excluded. On the contrary, if it be true that the most perfect beauty results from a perfect fitness and congruity of different parts, then surely it will be secured best by uniting the solemn words of our ritual to suitable and sublime notes. And besides this, it is one of the most striking perfections of our English cathedral music that it includes more *variety*, and yet retains therewith a greater degree of *unity* than can be observed in the church music of any other country, or in any secular music whatever. This last point is specially deserving of consideration. It would appear that there are five stages or degrees, as it were, in the application of music to the adornment of our cathedral service. For, in the first place, we have the plain monotone (and on the best manner of executing this part a great deal may be said, for which we have no space in this article); this is the simplest mode, but one of the most important, for in truth the monotone is the Church's ordinary prayer-note. Then, secondly, there is the system of inflexions used in the versicles and responses, and most valuable for its antiquity, embodying as it does the ancient "plainsong" of the Church from the very beginning of Christianity. That much can be said on this branch of the subject is evidenced by the mass of interesting information on the point which is contained in Dr. Jebb's admirable *Choral Responses and Litanies*, a book which should be in the hands of all who desire to acquire a knowledge of this matter. The third degree or stage is the psalm-chant, concerning which there has unfortunately been a great deal of injurious controversy, through the conflicting efforts of two opposing parties, of whom one would assimilate it to the second kind or degree described above, while the other would fain make it as elaborate and florid as the next kind, which we must mention; while in truth the great beauty of the cathedral psalm-chant lies in its intermediate character between these two, as we hope, on a future occasion, to prove. The fourth degree is that in which the music appears in the form technically termed "services," consisting of regular, harmonized, and formal settings of the canticles, the Kyrie Eleison, the Nicene Creed, the Sanctus, and the Gloria in Excelsis, on which all our best composers have expended their most assiduous exertions, and in which they have excelled accordingly. This kind of music has had its own abuses also; solos, duets, and florid accompaniments have in too many instances deprived it at once of its solemnity and of its peculiar character, while on the other hand attempts have not been wanting to supersede it altogether, and substitute for it either the psalm-chant, or even music of the second kind already mentioned; but into this matter we have not space to enter at present. Lastly, there is the *anthem*, the legitimate field for the exhibition of every development of the highest art. In the repertories of our cathedrals we have an enormous stock of anthems by English composers, among which are a large number of compositions of the noblest type; and it is lamentable to think how often these admirable works are allowed to become obsolete, while their place is occupied by adaptations of the works of foreign writers—works often of high merit in themselves, but utterly unfitted in style for our service,

intended for other purposes, set to other words, in different languages, requiring female voices for their adequate execution, and completely murdered if shorn of the full orchestra with which they were intended to be accompanied. To render a cathedral service what it ought to be these five degrees or kinds of music should each be kept perfect and distinct; in each of them sublimity should be aimed at, and a devotional character maintained; and above all those who execute them should be efficient as vocalists, devout and real as worshippers, and sufficient in numbers to save the service from that reproach of meagreness and weakness which has been too often and too justly cast at it by the ecclesiastical musicians of other lands. Our cathedral choirs have been cut down to so scant a complement of voices that anything like a grand choral effect is of the rarest occurrence; and to make matters worse, the clergy of our cathedrals, in too many cases, either cannot or will not *sing*, as they surely ought to do were the theory of cathedral establishments duly carried out. All these matters need to be reformed. Is it too much to hope for a speedy restoration of the choral element to its proper condition, now that so much is being done to the *fabrics* wherein the glorious sounds of musical praise should be efficiently upraised? Let us hope the best, for there are many influential persons who are beginning to see the question in its proper light. Let us not despair. *Deus providebit.*

Architectural Development.



THE hasty criticism which amateurs so much love to pass on the works of artists are often, no doubt, valuable in the stimulus they give to the artists, though they are sometimes, it is to be feared, very damaging to the tone of the critic himself. Even when they are hastily and thoughtlessly made they compel careful work, and the endeavour after so complete a mastery of the subject in hand as shall leave no point open to attack. No artist ought, therefore, to regret for his own sake the habit in which all the world now-a-days indulges, of criticising unmercifully everything that is done; but rather he should be thankful to find so much interest taken in his work as to lead to criticism of any kind. Few classes of men, however, seem to us to have to bear such criticisms more frequently than our architects. They are charged by one critic with being mere copyists, by another with refusing to copy, by a third with never attempting to develope, and by a fourth with pretending to be artists when they find it impossible to invent a new style. And yet, in the midst of all these charges, it is the fact that, owing to the successes achieved on the continent by some of our leading Gothic architects, our English reputation in this branch of art has rapidly risen of late, out of that slough of despond in which the vapid dulness of three centuries of classicism had immersed it. Nor is it to be wondered at if our architects make themselves a reputation, when we think for a minute on the enormous work which the English Church has been able to give them to do during the last fifteen or twenty years. In no other part of Europe has the same opportunity been afforded; passing over Spain, Naples, the States of the Church, where nothing has been done, and Bavaria, Prussia, Austria, and the rest of Germany, where a good deal of work of only moderate merit has been produced: let us see what is the case in France. Here, since the accession of the Emperor, much has undoubtedly been achieved, but the state and the state only has been the employer, and the architects employed have been few in number, and all of them trained in the narrowest academical traditions, and without that healthy freedom of rivalry which has done so much in every way for us. In France the revival of the old form of architecture has been, to a very remarkable extent, a purely archæological and antiquarian revival. It has been an attempt to repeat exactly what has been done before and in the same country.

French architects seem to be careless to study, even slightly, the art of other lands; and the highest praise we can ever award to their work is, that it is well copied, whilst it is but too often—even in the hands of a Viollet le Duc—tame, spiritless, and formal. In England a very contrary course has been followed, and, as we believe, with the best possible result. The employers are everywhere throughout the land, and the employed are busy in the study not only of their own old national art, but in all the art illustrative of it in other countries also. But some protest is continually heard in favour of the other system, or some discussion arises which shows that there are still those amongst us who cherish so dearly all their old associations as to tolerate no novelty, and to look with dread on any of those studies of foreign art which might be expected to aid in giving freshness to the eye, and practice to the hand, of the architect. Rendering all honour to the motives of those who thus think, we, nevertheless, adopt the contrary side with thorough confidence. The whole question lies, in truth, in a nutshell. Every artist must if his nature is good, or his power great, impress his character on his work. Our painters begin by studying patiently the works of the greatest masters of old, and end, with the unanimous approval of the world, in the invention or creation each for himself of his own peculiar manner. Yet theirs is an imitative, whilst an architect's is much more of a creative art; what is lawful for the one cannot be less so for the other: and the refusal to grant the same liberty to the architect as to the painter would be summarily to strike him out from among the professors of the fine arts, and to place our only national art altogether in the hands of second or third rate men. We should have poor copying and no invention, dry bones indeed, and no spirit or inspiration. But invention and inspiration are words to be used cautiously, seeing that among the fancies of the most ignorant and conceited architects, none seems to be more common than that of the *invention* of a style.

Now, no style of architecture ever has been invented, or ever can be invented. Style in architecture is a gradual growth, a gradual working out of principles of construction. But no new principle of construction has been discovered for centuries, and we believe, with Mr. Ruskin, that no such discovery is possible. The men, therefore, who spend their time in aspirations after a new Victorian style, are pursuing a shadow, and trifling with their work. They affect to see bondage and servility in the study of ancient art, and no scope in it for the development of fancy, invention, or artistic skill. How wrongly they argue is best proved by the fact that the noblest works of our time, are all done by men whose voices are never raised in these vain laments, and whose skill has all been gained in the worshipful study of their forefathers' works.

Originality and invention are, in fact, as open to us at the present day as ever; but there is no royal road to success in art, and patient study and earnest purpose are as necessary in her domain as in that of science. That study ought to be, first and above all, of the art of our own country; next, of that of all foreign countries, so far as both of these are not opposed to that principle of truth which is the first essential of success; and, finally, that study should be zealously devoted to such portions of ancient buildings as are themselves pure and good for ever, even though their surroundings are impure or effete. Such, for instance, is the sculpture which adorned the Greek buildings, and which is as perfect as any the world will ever see. The human form is the same for ever, and the noblest type of the Greek is equally the noblest type for us. The inventions and improvements in construction, which have taken all life out of Greek architecture, have left Greek sculpture fortunately unscathed, and we are able to look at it with almost as much pleasure as at those exquisite works of the Middle Ages, which, founded on the same studies, and approaching often to the same degree of excellence, are at the same time full of a religious, poetic, and chivalric sentiment which endears them to our inmost intelligence.

Unfortunately, it is plain to any one who will look at the works of our architects that those among them who seek to make architectural developments possible by such studies as we have indicated are in a minority. But with all our power we urge others to follow in their steps. Let them compare the works of those who are the best known for their studies of old buildings with the works of those who look on such studies as loss of time, and they will see where the greater originality is to be found. That a school which dispenses with originality, or objects to development, can live is an impossibility, and the fate of our architects from the time of Wren is the best evidence we can derive of the fact. Let then none be deterred by the occasional protest of a zealous archæologist from the attempt to be as original as possible in his works. We are all paying our national art a much higher tribute when we attempt to improve on it than when we attempt to stereotype it, and it is a claim of strength, not a confession of weakness, to assert that this is our proper function. Those who sneer at architectural development, and who raise their narrow cry for mere imitation of mediæval works, show us that they do not appreciate a tithe of the truth which it teaches: for mediæval work was—if ever any in this world was—extraordinarily personal, and the result of vigorous self-reliance and individuality in the artist. These are the qualities which are still required; and it is not too much to say that in some degree they exist among us; when we see the rapid strides which we are already making in the direction of a real good and genuine development founded upon our old national art.

Windermere.

WILSON used to draw melancholy pictures enough of Windermere invaded by a Cockney host. But he probably was relieved of some agony on behalf of the Queen of Lakes when he overlooked the present unsympathetic visitation of Liverpool excursionists. Liverpool has clearly every right to get the air it likes the best; but it is equally open to others to avoid meeting Liverpool when it is abroad in the act. Those hills were reared up there before "cheap trips" were organized at Euston Square; and those who knew them when there were no railroads may, without being supercilious, reasonably object to have to face the contrasts of garden and city—nature and commerce—Windermere and Liverpool. There may be those to whom life amongst the Lakes is something new; and to them we may indicate a special reason for going north this autumn time. Windermere, we understand, has not been given over this season to the sandwich-eating citizens, who come to "do" her, in a "business-like way," with a "return-ticket." The Exhibition at Brompton has happily drawn off the supply, and the hotel and lodging-house keepers heap up their anathemas on the "great shop" that has taken all the world to see it. But the change is, after all, only one of comparison. The antagonisms of nature and art are hardly to be watched without wondering where the indecencies of buying and selling, and building and "improving" everything will ever stop; and we would give nearly nothing for the soul of the man who only tells you that that Providence which set up the peak that kisses every cloud did not apprehend the capabilities of the site that was in such a manner lost to commercial purposes, or of him who cannot look upon the mighty stone, crowned with the hallowed moss of centuries, without thinking of the cunning of the mason, and the work of his chisel. Windermere, that can never quite be spoiled, is not the Windermere of those days when Christopher North looked down upon her quiet loveliness from Elleray, and declared she had no equal. Rival companies have fought for the monopoly of her waters, and the jealousies of wood and iron have run high—and sometimes for nothing—over some four unprofitable "steam yachts;" whilst

Bowness is threatened with gas-works, as, for the first time since the flood, shares are subscribed for in some Manchester gas undertaking that is to poison the fish and make Windermere smell. But with all this, and with more that is threatening, Windermere is yet unapproachable, though she has been got at by coarse tastes and unpicturesque crowds.

The prevailing phenomena of the Lakes are the rain and the Dissenters; but they may both be sufficiently met by an umbrella and a Church revival. It is our experience that, whilst the Lakes of England cannot be really known in a life-time, something may be seen of them all in a week. There are plenty of execrable guide-books from a shilling upwards, and Miss Martineau's clearly carries off the right to be known as the longest and the worst. But if any one new to the country will sanction us to show it him, and has only some ten days on his hands, we will undertake to lead him, if not with any of the self-satisfaction and fine writing of the guide-books, at least with the undertaking that we will not mislead him with any of the enthusiasm that is to be had from sixpence-soiled copies—up to all prices as the season advances. Bowness has paramount claims as a starting-place, and Saturday evening is perhaps, of all, the evening that we would rather get there. Sunday at Windermere sets out all the harmonies of nature supreme, and rest unbroken, as it seems to us, we only see them there; and if the Lake is to be fished or seen on Monday, the business of chartering "Jemmy Walker," and his boat "the Tory," should not be put off beyond Saturday night. Those who do not care to patronize Nonconformity, where there is at least no schism in the wild loveliness of a surpassing scene, will profit by the caution not to come to any bargain before "the Tory" and its owner are found, for half the preachers in half the conventicles let out "safe and commodious boats;" and an interpretation of "the gospel," with some novelties, is not unlikely to be offered without any extra charge by the native, who has his scruples about orthodoxy in the Church, but none about orthodoxy when it may be touted into his boat at two shillings an hour. It is impossible not to see that the Church is doing nothing throughout the whole of the Lake district. Dissent is strengthening itself only because there is nothing to meet it; and people go to hear the preaching grocer, or the unattached schismatic, because the parish Church puts out no *real* invitation. There is no Church in the country of the Lakes that, to our knowledge, is not in the hands of the "Evangelicals." Church work in the loveliest place in England means a dreary observance of a sublime liturgy twice every Sunday; and, at Windermere at least, it cannot be a reproach to Churchmen that they have brought up the schismatic "missions" that there swarm. The "Evangelicals" have had all the "souls" to themselves from the first; and the Church is only powerless because where her services are not travestied she is herself betrayed. Half a century ago there was not a Dissenter at Windermere; but, whilst there was a Church, there was no Church work, and an exciting and attractive form of schism was fetched out of Scotland by a mole-catcher, who left the extermination of those things that throw up the earth, to work on those who have long thrown up the worship of their God under their own parish spire. The Church, whose foundation is on a Rock, was after this sort superseded by the chapel proprietary that has its foundation on a mole-hill. These are all the antagonisms of the Church at Windermere—these are all her perils—"inspired" rat-catchers, and extemporaneous mole-killers! Generations have passed by the old Church porch only because, whilst the "business" of the day has looked like an invitation to enter in, there has been no fervour standing by to bring home to simple hearts the appeal. Can none of the hopeful, cheering, Church revivals, that, thank God, are marking our own time, reach where God has made all things so beautiful and fair? But nothing can be done till the fulness of the need is recognized. Churchmen must be found before Churches are restored; and we have sufficient reason to know that the tenure of Dissent will be

a very empty pretence so soon as a Communion that is simply glorious ceases to be parodied, and so soon as those who go about their Master's business take thought that apathy with them is a mockery, and unfaithfulness a crime. The Church amongst the Lakes is scarcely known; and before the first advent of real Church labour the pretensions of Dissent would collapse, and the mole-catching succession would disappear. A counterfeit presentment of that which is nothing when mutilated is nearly all that is set before nearly all the congregations of Cumberland and Westmoreland. The Church is overlooked only because she is hardly palpable. There is scarcely a daily service throughout the diocese. Celebrations of the Eucharist are scarcely anywhere more frequent than once in six weeks. The poor complain that they scarcely ever see the parson. The Churches would be almost a scandal to Calvin could he come back to comment on their coldness; and whilst these are the signs by which alone the Church is known, the mole-killer well may put aside his trap to catch a sect, and the boatman insist that he has a "call." This is the situation that the Church must set herself to face in the North; nor has she ever had a greater work mapped out before her in any corner of this land.

Something of Windermere, from end to end, may be seen in a day in "the Tory." Those who may be of our way of thinking will know better than go near the steamers. Although every form of poaching is in favour, as, for instance, taking pike with trimmers, and trout with an "otter," the fishing, which is generally of a sort to keep some families throughout the year, is better than good, we have reason to know, this season. Many a "big John" have we sent to scale, and whilst we have taken forty pounds weight of eels before breakfast, a pike of eleven pounds odd, and a trout of eight, we "once over" scored a hundred pike in a month, and have known them run to twenty-one pounds, twenty-seven pounds, and forty pounds a-piece. It was one of these times that we drew out of the renowned "Jemmy Walker," who kills more fish than any two of his kind, that he "never knew a Dissenter in that country of any account when he was fairly bottomed up;" and many are the good stories that he has got to show it, but he must tell them his own way, and in his own words. Tuesday should be given to Conistone—which was one of the best of char Lakes till commerce set up signs on its banks and poisoned the fish—returning to Bowness in the evening, and setting by Wednesday for the first bit of Cumberland. The scenery all the way between Windermere and Keswick, never quite the same, at every turn is always magnificent; and the road is through a country that has not been even overdone by the most impressible rhymers. The way is by Ambleside, Rydal, and Grasmere, past Helvellyn's foot, and one of the smallest chapels in England, to Keswick; and the Derwentwater hotel at Portinscale, at the head of Derwentwater, is as good as even the guide-books represent it. The next day Borrowdale and Wastwater, Buttermere, Crummock Water, and Bassenthwaite may be "done," and Ullswater reached on Friday. Perhaps the way by Brotherswater, Kirkstone, and Troutbeck, is the finest in the whole district; and there is nothing else as fine as that turn where the depth of the valley below is at its greatest, and the supremacy of Windermere again asserts itself through the trees. In the six days thirteen of the Lakes will have been passed, and above a dozen of the highest peaks will have been seen. But, we believe with Wilson, that when it is all summed up, there is nothing quite like Windermere on all the earth besides—nothing like her when asleep she mirrors the majesty of the hills that stand round her, and nothing like her when she cannot rest. He was not merely fabled who said this, and had yet been up and down in the world. Let him who thinks we set this Lake of Lakes too high see them all this autumn time, and fairly tell us whether, though he may have fancied each in turn, he does not give, on coming back, unmixed allegiance to their Queen.

Influence of the Clergy.



HERE can be no dispute, even amongst its bitterest opponents, as to the *fact* of the vast increase of the influence of the National Church over all classes of the population during the last quarter of a century. That influence, moreover, is of the best and most legitimate kind. It is the offspring not of political party, but of religious conviction; it is due not to platform oratory, but to a steady improvement in the discharge of those offices which it is the part of a National Church to perform towards the nation. It would be impossible now to awaken from a London mob the cry which followed the coach of Queen Anne,—“We hope your Majesty is for the *Church* and Dr. Sacheverel. It would have been still more difficult to have wrung from the Churchmen of that period those munificent gifts, those sacrifices of time, and energy, and thought which have in our own day studded the land with churches and schools, each in its own district an *ἐπιτεχίσμα* of incalculable power, and by the multiplication of Colonial dioceses have brought the Anglican communion into direct contact with the most remote sections of Christendom.

We can then thankfully acknowledge that the social influence of the English Church has increased, and is increasing; but there is another aspect of the question which is not so satisfactory. A large proportion of nominal Church-people have little or no intelligent hold of the doctrines or discipline of the communion to which they belong. It is necessary here to distinguish carefully between the influence of the Clergy and the influence of the Church. The personal influence of a clergyman is very great, especially in country parishes. A hundred causes contribute to this. His education, his social position, his free access to the highest and the lowest, his command of charitable funds, give him great and legitimate influence. It is remarkable how much of neglect and misconduct is required in a clergyman to destroy the respect with which the middle and lower classes in agricultural parishes still regard the Church Minister. Yet, with all the deference still conceded to the Parochial clergyman, it must, we think, be allowed that a large number of those who share fully in this feeling, and are as far removed as possible from any tendency to dissent, understand little of the distinguishing principles of the Church. They adhere to its communion, they frequent its worship, partly from habit, partly from a distaste for cant, yet without any clear understanding or firm grasp of its doctrines. Dr. Newman, in one of his post-secession addresses, tells us that it is impossible to form a conception of the Church of England divested of her snug parsonages and venerable sanctuaries; that she has no well-defined theory or principles, no distinct position on the great map of human thought and faith. The insinuation is utterly false. The Church of England system is as marked and tangible as the Romish. Yet *practically* there is some foundation for the sneer, for the bulk of her members have little knowledge of what that system is, and may be therefore little able to conceive of her divorce from the externals of her providential position. The Roman Catholic, however ignorant, has a conscious grasp of the peculiar doctrines of his communion; hence he is rarely to be drawn off to any other mode of worship. The Dissenter is crammed with specious reasons for his dissent; the mass of Church-people, if asked why they are such, would be for the most part unable to give any better answer than that they were brought up to the Church, and liked it best.

Now we do not undervalue this instinctive, traditional Churchmanship—far from it. But we wish to inquire how it comes to pass that there is often amongst Church-people of sense and education so little knowledge of the constitution of the Church. It is the absence of this knowledge which renders the more earnest-minded of the lower, and lower-middle class an easy prey to all kinds of heresy. We

feel sure that every parish priest will acknowledge the fact to be as we have stated it. Let us see if we can detect the cause.

We note, then, as the foremost cause the lack of dogmatic teaching in our Schools and in our Churches. How very rarely does the Sunday sermon convey *information*. It is hortatory or consoling; it may be calculated to stimulate and alarm, to reprove and encourage; it seldom *instructs*. Those very points upon which we complain that people are defective; the principles of the Church of England as opposed to Romanism and Dissent are very rarely the subject of our pulpit addresses. The case is different in the Romish chapel or the meeting-house. While the Church of England clergyman is content to assume (though he knows well enough it is otherwise) that his congregation are well informed as to their own principles, the dissenting teacher is perpetually impressing upon his hearers their distinctive tenets, furnishing them with arguments, such as they are, against the Church, and storing their memories with texts which apparently make for their peculiar views. Similarly in church schools: the dogmatic teaching is here again, we believe, very defective. We are never surprised to be told that the Dissenters do not object to send their children to such and such a school. We cannot conceive why they should object, for it is comparatively rare to find the child armed upon the week-day with any plain reason why upon the Sunday evening he should not go to the meeting-house as readily as to the church. It will be urged that the Catechism is taught in all church schools—true; and out of the Catechism may no doubt be drawn by the careful catechist the whole church argument. But the logical connection between the truths contained in the Catechism and practical Churchmanship is not so obvious as to leave room for no further instruction upon the system of the Church and the consequent duties of its members.

It is not difficult to trace to its source this deficiency of dogmatic teaching. It springs, we believe, first from a dislike of controversy. The Church clergyman does not rejoice in troubled waters. The "turbulent priest" is not the appellation which even his opponents would give now-a-days to the country parson. His tendency is rather to concede too much for the sake of quiet. His disposition is not sufficiently proselytizing. We have no wish to see him transformed into the fiery controversialist, or the parish church turned into a debating-room; but when a religious body is surrounded and permeated with other religious communities, it is not charity, but folly, to ignore their existence, and to teach, Sunday after Sunday, as if there were but one creed in the land, and the congregation were never likely to hear any opinions but their own. We do not think that it is sufficiently recognized by the clergy that the parish church and the Sunday's rest are given them as instruments for *instructing* their people. Then and there the education of those who have left the school is to be carried on. The weekly sermons would, we submit, not only be more profitable, but be listened to with far more interest, if the preacher would now and then lay aside the notion that his church is filled with *profligates* who require to be converted, and suppose it to be occupied with well-disposed but ill-instructed persons who need to be informed.

A second source of the want of dogmatic teaching in the English Church is, we venture to suggest, the absence of an accurate theology amongst the clergy themselves. Is it too much to affirm that there are many points, both of doctrine and ecclesiastical order, upon which clergymen have not made up their own minds? Their ideas are hazy and indistinct. They are hampered in their honest convictions by the dread of being thought narrow-minded and uncharitable. Hence, when they begin to teach, they shrink from plain and precise statements. They qualify, and guard, and counterguard their assertions until the whole force of what they assert is eaten out, and the effect upon their hearers is to leave them bewildered in a maze of conflicting sentiments, from which they take refuge in the conclusion that the

whole matter in question is one of indifference. If the clergy would guard effectually their people from the sinister influences of Romanism and Dissent, they must first thoroughly clear up their own notions upon these subjects. They must learn to distinguish sharply between the person and the thing, and not be afraid of expressing themselves unmistakably about an error, from a maudlin tenderness for individuals who have fallen into it.

To the lack of dogmatic teaching we will add a further cause of the faint and uncertain grasp by which many of its members hold on to the National Church. There is little or no parochial visitation, except amongst the lowest class. The strength of Nonconformity is to be found among the small shopkeepers in our towns, and the petty farmers in our rural districts; and these are just the people who never see the clergyman as a clergyman. We do not say that he never enters their doors, but when he does so, it is for the most part only to exchange a few civil inquiries. He does not talk to them as he talks to the poor man on sacred subjects, or try to enlist their sympathies and excite their interest upon Church topics. He does not seek to draw out their ideas, to meet their objections, to solve their difficulties. He visits the labourer in his official capacity; but when he crosses the road and drops into the house of the employer, he drops the clerical character, and begins to speak about anything else than the religion of which he is the accredited officer. This lower-middle class have been for a long time more than any other without pastoral care. Their respectability has in this respect excommunicated them. They have been regarded as above receiving instruction, and too insignificant to be looked to for aid, and thus the ties which are cemented by giving or receiving have in their case no existence. There is a great mistake here. We believe that if the clergy would pay the same professional attention to the family of the shopkeeper which he devotes to that of the labourer he would be amply repaid. It is a class full of intelligence, not illiberal, ready to give a hearty greeting to the parish priest as such. Let him only not be afraid of taking his proper position, of speaking to this class, as he speaks to those beneath them, of what he and they are most interested in, and he will, we are persuaded, find eager listeners and sensible inquirers. There is a mine of moral wealth in that stratum of society which is at present least reached by the Church. It would supply our colonies with missionary clergy, our home-parishes with a working diaconate. Nay, if our increasing population is to be adequately supplied with pastoral supervision, it is from these classes that we must seek to draft men into the priesthood, not lowering the standard of theological acquirement, but placing the highest theological education within reach, and encouraging the farmer and the tradesman to avail themselves of it for their children. We have heard of a modern French bishop saying to an English clergyman,—"Ah! if the Churches were not divided, what a glorious warfare might be waged with heathenism—you, from your immense wealth, could supply the FUNDS, and we would find the MEN." But *why* should the French Church be more able to provide "*the men*" than the English Church, save that the English Church has not yet striven to interest in her claims and her work that vast portion of the population which lies between the gentry and the labourer? It is here that her influence is weak, and it is weak because that parochial visitation which has been proved so powerful an agent with the lowest has not been adapted and exercised amongst the class next above them in the social scale.



Meddling.



AUTHORITY and influence are terms expressing two very distinct methods of dealing with bodies of men, managing establishments, and ruling subordinates. Authority commands, drives, exacts implicit obedience. Influence persuades, entices, counsels. Both methods may be combined or act independently with advantage in their several spheres of jurisdiction; both, duly and wisely administered, may be equally successful in accomplishing their end: but not uncommonly fail of their full purpose by degenerating into unreasonable interference or meddling.

Some good men have a passion for meddling with the concerns of others quite amounting to a monomania. We laugh at it behind their backs, and speak of it with some qualifying euphemism as their characteristic habit or idiosyncrasy; when really it is a bad vice, deserving stern correction, both as highly demoralizing in its effects upon the subject of it, and from the immense amount of annoyance and misery it causes to other people. Nine-tenths of the petty torments of life are inflicted by some one going out of his way, sometimes with the best, sometimes with the worst intention, to worry you with gratuitous advice, suggestions of difficulty, offers of co-operation, obstructive interference, and refusing to let you alone in your quiet pursuit, whether of business or pleasure, by paths of your own choosing. One immediate evil consequence upon a man's character of this love of meddling is the necessary distraction of his attention from a punctual fulfilment of his own proper duties. That "no one does more work than an idle man" is a true proverb, which, with equal point and paradox, may be stated in other words, "there is no greater idler than a busybody." And the proverb applies alike to every rank and relationship in life. Every one has his or her own relative and social duties providentially assigned, from which there is no escaping without culpable neglect, and the neglect of which is in no degree whatever compensated by the most active and painstaking encroachment on another's province. Such activity is, properly speaking, idleness, if industry be rightly defined as an assiduous application of mind and body to the duties of one's calling, or, as the common phrase happily expresses it, *minding your own business*.

Yet, it is quite a curious trait observable in human nature generally, how almost every one feels the irksomeness and drudgery of his appointed routine, and the positive relief of even hard work voluntarily undertaken. Hence, however we account for it, it comes to pass—

"ut nemo, quam sibi sortem
Seu ratio dederit, seu fors objecerit, illā
Contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentes."

The *sutor* is always shirking his *crepidam*, for some one else's business beyond it. The housemaid takes pleasure in neglecting the dust and cobwebs in the parlour, while she does a little amateur cooking by the kitchen fire; the cook runs away from the revolving spit when she ought to be intent on basting, in order that she may attend the baby for a little bit, or help to put the other children to bed in the nursery. Nay, this universal human characteristic has been even turned to good practical advantage in the case of "idle scamps" whom despairing friends have persuaded to emigrate to the British colonies, and who have been sometimes beguiled there into active and honest work, under a sort of vague notion that they were not seriously doing business, but as it were playing at keeping shop or being shepherds and farm labourers.

The peccadillo, we repeat, is almost universal, though luckily it does not always find indulgence to the same excess of interference as we once heard attributed to a goodnatured philanthropic old gentleman, who was said

to take in a daily newspaper for the sake of having some gratuitous employment suggested every day by the advertisements or paragraphs describing lost jewellery, runaway daughters, unclaimed dividends, missing registrations, or other mysterious *desiderata*, which might set him upon an exciting correspondence of further inquiry or advice, or at least supply an occasion of communication with Scotland yard, or the editor of the journal, that he sincerely regretted he could not give any authentic information throwing light upon the subject in question.

But even the very best of men are liable to the natural infirmity; and, as we said at starting, an otherwise commendable character, and a life of usefulness are often marred by its indulgence. Clergymen, as much as any others, are obnoxious to a love of intermeddling. In the present day, especially perhaps, they are tempted to be pragmatical, whether in the way of little gratuitous offices exacted of them by their friends on a false estimate of their leisure and business-like capacity; or from an over-addiction to scientific and literary pursuits, to which their tastes and education naturally incline them; or to others of a civil and purely secular kind; or lastly, and most commonly of all, through a postponement of their higher duties, which belong to them as priests,—administering sacraments, saying prayers, and preaching,—to what they consider a course of active usefulness adapted to the spirit of the age, in various ways of a semi-pastoral character, by which they hope to increase the happiness or raise the character of their people.

Clergymen, indeed, from the fact of their prominent and paternal position in a parish, seem invested with a sort of special call to manage the affairs of others. Their sense of supposed duty in this direction often proceeds to the extent of constantly assuming a right to intermeddle with their most private concerns. They sometimes even carry on a *quasi*-system of espionage, and practise stratagems of management, by employing a few pet parishioners as detectives and common informers over the private sayings and doings of their neighbours. We have heard of the extreme case of a parish-priest who went the length of dictating to his Squire the proper fashion and material for his servants' livery. Sometimes the same sort of systematic intermeddling is less directly carried out through the lady or ladies of the parsonage. But even when it exists in its least offensive form, it is sure, where it exists at all, to lower in people's estimation the sacredness of the priestly character, to excite many a secret resentment and murmur against what must be considered and is inquisitorial and impertinent, and to damage the real authority and influence of the pastoral office. It may be, in fact, as an intended warning against this weakness that we have the record of the highest possible Example of ministerial duty refusing, even when urgently solicited by an interested party, to meddle in the private temporal concerns of His disciples, saying, "Man, who made Me a judge or divider over you?"

And what is truly said of the parish-priest in his pastoral relation to his people generally may be applied with equal force to his treatment of individuals who stand towards him in any subordinate relation, such as the assistant curate or schoolmaster of the parish. The habit of undue or needless interference with their duties is a continual source of petty annoyance and vexation, which makes their life miserable, and seriously damages their efficiency. But the evil is ten times more intolerable, of course, when it extends to meddling with their personal or private matters, as is not very uncommonly the case. Surely, the wisest managers are such as least interfere with the particular methods and conduct of their subordinates, who give their general orders, and are satisfied with results. Kindness and good intention are no sufficient plea for unasked advice or capricious intermeddling of any sort. "*Sedulitas stulte quem diligit urget.*" Nothing but the simple discharge of one's own plain and immediate duty can justify interference with the freedom of another's conduct. Some sacred writers have piously considered that no small portion of the bliss and peaceful-

ness of Heaven itself will hereafter consist in the "wonderful order and obedience" of the saints and holy angels, each incessantly intent on the exact fulfilment of his own appointed duty, none encroaching on or unduly obstructing the performance of another's.

Country Village Schools.



HERE has been so much controversy, and there probably will be so much more, about grants from Government to parish and district schools, that it may not be amiss to consider the plain simple wants of a very large number of them—practically of all rural village schools in agricultural parishes—and how they may be best supplied. We allude to places in which there is but little retail trade, and no manufacture but such as is domestic.

Now the qualifications for the master in such a place are few and easy of acquirement. They consist simply of being able to read clearly, and to teach to read clearly; of the same knowledge in writing; of a competency and ready habit to instruct in arithmetic in the earlier rules, including the Rule of Three; of good spelling, the primary elements of grammar; and lastly, a certain knowledge of Scripture history, and of Church doctrine, so as to expound, as far as children can take it in, the Creed, the Catechism, and the Moral Law. All beyond this, as a necessary qualification, is thrown away in a large majority of the parishes to which we advert. And only a few years since such a master, of moral conduct and respectable habits, was usually attainable at such remuneration as could be gathered together in these localities. We would put such cost at a house and small garden, forty pounds a-year for himself, made up, where possible, by subscriptions and the penny weekly payments of scholars, and beyond that, ten pounds a-year for his wife, or sister, or some other female capable of and apt to teach plain needlework. Now the whole expense of such a school as this, for one hundred children in a rural parish, would be about seventy pounds a-year. There are the fifty pounds for the master and mistress; and the books, and stationery, and slates, and materials for the sewing school, with a few simple rewards for good attendance, together with fuel and occasional repairs: these would average twenty pounds a-year.

Seventy pounds is a large sum to be raised in such a place. The penny payments realized will probably not exceed twelve to fourteen pounds of the money. Thus nearly sixty pounds must, without external aid, be raised by local voluntary contributions. In nine cases out of ten the clergyman of the parish, where he is not absolutely unequal to such demands, finds a very large proportion of this sum. If there are resident proprietors, they assist; where there are sole or nearly sole proprietors, they occasionally bear the chief part, and rarely the whole burden. Non-resident proprietors do not very frequently contribute very largely. The tenant farmers in a rural parish cannot be persuaded to subscribe to schools at all in many parts of England; and even where they do so partially, the trouble of inducing them and collecting their contributions (for they greatly dislike fixed annual payments) is very irksome, and rests mainly on the clergyman.

Now these do seem the occasions where the grants from the Privy Council Board would be most usefully and honestly applied. They are the very places where it perpetually happens that they are unattainable. The first demand from that Board is that you employ a certificated master before you receive a Capitation Grant. These certificated masters require higher salaries; so the pecuniary aid is nullified. A second demand has often been that schoolrooms really most sufficient with good ventilation should be rebuilt, or wooden floors substituted for good paving-brick floors; unnecessary alterations and expenses for which it would be hopeless to ask any parish-

ioners to subscribe. They will sometimes, with aid of neighbouring gentry, build a schoolhouse where there is none, or one clearly not fit or adequate to the purpose; but they would laugh in your face if you submitted to them some of the fanciful requirements made by the Board for alterations.

Again, the certificated master in such places as we refer to is a very burdensome person in other respects. He raises the general price of all other village masters around him, rendering them dissatisfied, and indeed difficult to be procured. What has been the consequence? We now constantly find rural parishes falling back on female instruction only, simply because the increased salaries of masters have rendered it impossible to find funds for the employment of males. In such cases the higher education of the master throws back the education of the poor. A female teacher has seldom sufficient control over boys of above ten years of age; and though it is true that the removal of boys from school at or about this age is very common, and is from many causes likely to increase, and is, in our judgment, complained of with little consideration of the facts of the case, still it would be well to be in a position to provide proper superintendence over them if they remain longer. There is another way in which village masters of too high attainments often act injuriously for education of the rural poor. The farmers are jealous of them. They give themselves airs in such places, or are deemed, often unfairly, to do so. If they only teach that which the more humble master teaches, it is obvious that they are unnecessary; if, on the contrary, they try to push on into geography, some history, a little more grammar, or more recondite arithmetic (all forgotten by the few so instructed who go to the plough at twelve years old), it becomes hopeless to ask any farmer or tradesman to aid in supporting such a school. He has a very ready and fair answer to any such request. "I have heavy expenses," he says, "with my means, to educate my own child in such branches as are named above, and so to qualify him for a life not of mere manual labour without head-work. I have no money to give towards providing the children of the poor with teaching which is not suited to their position in life, and which will in almost every case be simply wasted." There is really no answer to be given to a plain homely man who says thus much.

There have been, and we hope there always will be, some men who emerge from the lowest condition of labour, and the humblest elements of education, and become more or less eminent in different walks of life. But this is no argument in favour of more refined education for the poor. They were quite as numerous, were these "self-help" men, before the invention of normal schools and certificated masters as they have ever been since, or are ever likely to be. We do not object to these schools or these masters as useful, perhaps necessary, for many positions in towns; all that we contend is that they are not, as a general rule, of good service in education in rural villages. There is small doubt but that the demand will create the supply, as it did some twenty-five years ago, and that there will be rural schoolmasters enough if rural schoolmasters are encouraged. There were usually some two or three breeding up to it in every school of seventy scholars, as monitors or sub-teachers, before the class called pupil-teachers on salary were invented. They are now rarely seen, and hence perhaps one of the causes why boys are removed so much earlier than in the recollection of most of us. As far as our experience goes, the monitor system of Dr. Bell acted quite as well as the pupil-teacher of the modern scheme, until about the last twenty years. It had also the advantage of much more simplicity, and far less responsibility to the managers, with more easy machinery to work. We admit that with the earlier removal of children from rural schools it is often now difficult to carry on the monitor system, however sufficient and efficacious many of us remember it to have been. We may, nevertheless, try it on an improved method by small monthly remuneration to the older and more forward boys, which may incline some few more to remain longer in the

school, and have a more encouraging effect than the pupil-teacher brought, probably, from some distant place.

Let us hope that a common-sense view of the question may at last prevail, and that aid from the Privy Council may be afforded where it is so deeply wanted, without endless conditions and restrictions which so often mar all benefit. If in the case of the rural school, the expenses of which are averaged at seventy pounds per annum, some fifth part would be supplied from these public funds, without any reference to the certificate or non-certificate of the master, to the flooring of the school with wood or fanciful arrangement of desks, the general improvement in village schooling and facilities in organizing it would be great. Let the roof, and floor, and walls of the building be sound, the size and elevation sufficient for ventilation according to the number of scholars; let the master be a good moral man, fit to give the instruction detailed above; let the income be simply a question between him and the managers, and the number and progress of the scholars ascertained by some simple visitation at intervals; and a Capitation Grant be given on the whole school, subtracting only those who have been absent the larger proportion of any year (which will avoid the endless tabular calculations now made), and consideration be made for the case of schools in very scattered hamlets, which create so much impediment to regularity of attendance in some rural districts: thus the spread of rural education will probably be far more satisfactory than it is at present, while the expenditure of the large sums voted for these useful objects will be more just and productive of wider good, as the funds may be relieved from a large part of the many primary charges by gradual diminution, and really applied to the teaching of the poor, where there are few rich persons to provide for it. Let there be provision against abuse of grants, but only carried so far that inspections cost not more than they are worth, or far more than any probable abuse might cause to be wasted.

Increase of the Episcopate.

AT the commencement of the reign of Henry VIII. the population of this country is supposed to have been about four millions; and the number of archbishops and bishops then existing was twenty-one; reckoning, therefore, the population at 4,200,000, the average number of people committed to the charge of each bishop would be 200,000. Archbishop Cranmer, however, was so fully convinced that this episcopal staff was insufficient adequately to perform the onerous duties of this sacred office that he advised King Henry to erect several new bishoprics as a great means for reforming the Church; and, in pursuance of his advice, the king drew up a list of 19 new bishoprics to be added to the existing Episcopate. Though this scheme was not carried out, yet by the statute 26 Henry VIII. cap. 14 provision was made for the appointment of 26 suffragan or coadjutor bishops; and by a subsequent statute the number of regular bishops was increased to twenty-seven by the erection of the sees of Oxford, Peterborough, Gloucester, Bristol, Chester, and Westminster (the last afterwards suppressed). To adapt, therefore, our hierarchy to the low standard in which Henry VIII. found it, proportioning our spiritual governors to our present population, it is requisite that the Episcopate should be increased to the number of 100; and if brought to the level at which King Henry VIII. fixed it, independent of suffragans, the number must be raised to 125.

But, setting aside all comparisons with other times and countries, when the work which the Church imposes on her chiefest spiritual governors is fairly estimated, when it is recollected that the bishop is the ultimate referee in ecclesiastical disputes and controversies, and that he must consequently be prepared to meet continued calls on his time and attention, and to carry on an extensive corres-

pondence with the several members of the Church; that he has to advise, reprove, and correct the clergy of his diocese; to keep an eye upon clerical delinquencies, and to enforce church discipline; that he is required to visit every parish in his diocese once a year, not content himself with the modern practice of holding a triennial visitation in the cathedral town, where the clergy visit him; to administer the rite of confirmation to those persons in his diocese who are of a proper age and capacity for the reception of that sacred ordinance; to examine the candidates for Holy Orders, and to hold ordinations in the several Ember Weeks; that he has undertaken at his consecration to teach and exhort with wholesome doctrine to withstand and convince the gainsayers, and to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines; besides preaching on special occasions; attending and presiding at clerical meetings; holding diocesan synods, and taking part in the deliberations at provincial synods; to which duties must be added an attendance during the session as a spiritual peer in the Upper House of Parliament: it will be generally admitted that, all the facilities supplied by railways and Post-office notwithstanding, the area of most of our dioceses needs contraction, and that the number of the people and clergy committed to the charge of each individual bishop needs considerable diminution.

Now, if the Church and State were perfectly independent of each other, measures would doubtless be taken by the Church for providing her members with a sufficiency of Episcopal supervision; or, if the union between Church and State was as complete in reality as it is in theory, the State would feel itself bound to remedy this obvious defect in her religious organization. One principal difficulty of supplying the acknowledged deficiency in the number of our chiefest spiritual governors arises from the present anomalous relations of Church and State, owing to the presence of the Nonconforming element in our constitution, though it must be confessed that till very lately there does not appear to have been any very great earnestness about it among Churchmen themselves; for since Dissenters are not merely tolerated in the State, but admitted as a constituent part of the body politic, and invested with a certain degree of political power, it is a natural consequence that this element in the constitution should exercise an influence antagonistic to the Church, and prevent or obstruct any operations of the State which may conduce to the Church's welfare and efficiency. An impatience of these obstructions has generated in the minds of some zealous Churchmen a desire for a separation between Church and State, imagining that they shall do the Church service by separating her altogether from these influences: but the true friends of both Church and State will use their best endeavours to hinder such a ruinous consummation; for they are well aware, that, whilst the State reaps the most essential benefits from the union, by the leavening of the masses of her teeming population through the spiritual instrumentality of the Church, the Church, on the other hand, is enabled to act more effectively and vigorously in her sacred calling by the support she derives from the arm of the temporal power. And though every believer in the divine institution and sacred character of the Church will feel assured that her vitality would not be destroyed by the severance of this political tie, yet he will gladly avail himself of these accidental aids, which the providence of her Divine Master and Head has furnished, for more extensively carrying out her important mission of evangelizing the world, and instead of shrinking from the task on account of the obstacles which impede the free course of Christian usefulness, the true Churchman will apply the energies of his mind in striving to remove impediments, and refute objections, so as to pave the way for a more complete development of the Church system.

The three great difficulties, resulting from the position in which the Church is placed in relation to the State, that present themselves immediately to our notice, when our attention is drawn to the increase of the Episcopate, are—

1. The social position of the hierarchy.
2. Some things

connected with the appointment to the office. 3. The supply of adequate funds for the maintenance of the additional officers.

These three points we shall proceed to discuss, as occasion serves, accepting the situation of the present relations between Church and State as an accomplished fact, not attempting to disturb the legal position conceded to dissent, but endeavouring to show that an extension of Church organization may be properly promoted by the State consistently with the modern theories of universal toleration, and without infringing upon the rational liberty claimed by those who refuse to adhere to the Church's doctrines, or to submit to her authority. Basing our arguments upon the great fundamental principle, that the State, having determined to recognize, in its corporate capacity, the Christian religion as the basis of its government, and having adopted the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, as the specially authorized form in which Christianity shall be inculcated to her members, is bound to protect the rights and maintain the efficiency of that branch of the Church Catholic, as the necessary condition of the compact which unites the Church and State together.

The Henley Regatta.

THE rowing at Henley this year will long be remembered from the generally fine performances of Oxford, and the almost entire absence of Cambridge. The cause, we understand, is this. The eight who were so unexpectedly overmatched by Oxford on the London water in April last are, we grieve to hear from Cambridge, many of them struck down by the unequal struggle, and are very sick. But, apart from any such catastrophe, the Cambridge rowing has only been just up to a passable standard for some little time past. During the time that Oxford has contributed Joseph Chitty, and Reade King—not to go back to George Hughes and the “glorious seven”—the pretensions of any Cambridge stroke, by comparison, have only been respectable. Cambridge rowing is, indeed, just now demoralized to all intents and purposes; and it seems only likely that the smaller University will run away from her challenger again next spring. Now why is this? There is no evidence to show that all the big men have taken to go to Oxford. The larger University cannot fairly complain that she does not have her stalwart levies from Eton; but there must be something wrong, when, whilst Cambridge confesses that her men want size, it is sufficiently clear to others that they also want style. The legitimate end of an oarsman is not illness; and no one is prepared to applaud an exhibition that ends in such a tragedy. At the late Henley Regatta the third Trinity four was all that came from the Cambridge water; and they fell short of the capacity to get away from a stale Oxford crew. It hardly mended the performance at Putney, and no one supposed that it need have been so bad. It is clear enough that some one somewhere is to blame. A university does not become suddenly barren of all rowing men. No one believes that if amongst the executive there are some great jealousies, there are not some big men waiting for a chance outside. There is a scandal to be put out of memory, and, for the sake of Cambridge, we hope it may be done without delay.

The Oxford crews, which were only college crews, were almost good enough to beat everything; and it is beyond any question that the eight who rowed in such fine form at Putney in April last could have won by as much more than they did if they had liked. It is true that the grand challenge cup went to the London Rowing Club, who were a length better at the finish than the boat at the head of the Oxford river; but this was the only race where the Oxford colours were not well in the front. Another year we hope to see University fairly matched against University rather than against others. University

men, without being fastidious, have a right to be too good for all company; and a race is almost over before starting when a crew that cannot show an oar above twenty-three has to stay against an eight where every man is about in his prime. There should be a challenge cup open only to the Universities and public schools, and if this is not done, and done now, it will come to this, that those Universities who have always made the meeting, will very properly cease to send crews.

The weather was on the whole, for the year, tolerable, and there was a real show of summer on the second day. For many of the events the racing was of the closest, and not only was there a dead heat for the sculls, but some very hot finishes all the way up the poplars. Oxford sent two college crews, which were just able to beat one another on the first day. We do not believe that whilst the Trinity boat is the champion of the Isis, for all that it is the best. It did not get rid of the University eight very easily, and, at a second trial, could not shake them off at all. There was the Oxford “stroke” with both boats; but we have seen a great improvement in their pace, and if it had been up to the average such a crew as that of the London Rowing Club could have only looked on at the race from behind.

The meeting of Eton and Radley promised to be interesting, but the result was one-sided enough. The Eton eight, a very heavy one for boys, could have won by any distance they pleased. The “form” of Radley may be easily improved, and they must learn to row as fast again before they will win anywhere. Eton, however, contrived to make a race with one of the best Oxford boats, and kept close enough to eventuate in a result that, if it was never in doubt, was never hollow. The third Trinity did not seem to move by the side of the Brazenose men, and over another mile they would have been distanced.

Mr. Woodgate was altogether the “lion” of both days, and his beautiful four made a terrible example of the Mersey men. In the two days Oxford won the ladies' challenge plate, the stewards' challenge cup, the visitors' challenge cup, and the silver goblets. The time was when Cambridge would have had some of these; but all she could do was to get away from an inefficient four of the London Rowing Club, to be afterwards left a clear length and a-half astern of Oxford. The racing throughout was good, but, with the exception of Mr. Woodgate, whose superb sculling has since put him at the head of the London river, was nowhere extraordinary. There were a great many reasons given for the absence of Cambridge, but none that seemed to explain anything. As a rowing University she was never lower than at this present, and she may find it harder to get rid of a losing stroke than to get her men to grow. All her best friends must wish to see the two events come off simultaneously. The Henley Regatta is nothing, after all, without both Universities, and the intervention of a mixed London club does not at all compensate for the absence of a Cambridge crew. The regatta was on the whole successful, but nothing will be gained by denying that at Henley-on-Thames it has often been surpassed.

Bishopric of Honolulu.

THE missionary exploits and endeavours are full of interest to a Christian; but there are special points which render the foundation of the Honolulu Episcopate pre-eminently interesting. It has justly been laid down as a maxim that an important test of the vitality of any branch of the Church is furnished by the number of its missions, and the energy with which they are conducted. In the earlier post-reformation history of the Church in England the minds of her sons were occupied with maintaining her Catholicity. They were times, too, of manifold trouble, and of persecution for religious differences such as has happily ceased to find a place amongst us. Then came a period of peace, and the subject

of missions was brought before the minds of Churchmen. A hundred years had to pass, however, before the seed sown could fructify. The dark night of the eighteenth century interposed, and the first sign of dawning day was the insertion by the Church of England among her offices of a form intended to be "useful for the baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others converted to the faith." It was not, however, till the time of the Evangelical Revival that missions began to be recognized as a serious portion of the Church's work; and the subsequent Catholic Revival has ensured the firm consolidation of missionary efforts, heretofore mere isolated preachings,—by leading men's minds to see the necessity of combining Apostolic order with Evangelical truth, and thus giving an impulse to the foundation of bishoprics in every direction.

From that time to the present these sees have been founded in connection with the Church of England, and for the subjects of the realm of England. They have been really subdivisions of territory already forming, by an ecclesiastical fiction, part of an English diocese; and their occupants, though actually, and to all intents and purposes, engaged in missionary work, have not been purely missionary bishops. Then came the first step—the first *real* step, in the history of the Church as an evangelizer, since the Reformation,—the appointment and consecration of Bishop Mackenzie. For the foundation of the Church of America in the last century was scarcely a missionary effort: it was rather a late concession of what America ought never to have been without—an *adequate* episcopate. An episcopate there was theoretically; practically it was but a fictitious one; the whole of America was supposed to be under the pastoral rule of the Bishop of London, and the Primacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury. By these prelates holy orders were conferred on those Americans who sought the work of the ministry; and the severance of the United States from England *politically* did not release those of the American Church from the allegiance due to their bishops. This was effected not by the War of Independence, but by the consecration of Seabury; or, rather, more correctly speaking, by that of Provoost and White in 1787, and their union in 1789 with Seabury and his clergy.

But the creation of the Hawaiian Episcopate is actually a far more important step in our Church history than even the constitution of the Church of America, or the mission of Mackenzie. A foreign king, having had Christianity in various forms brought before his notice, has deliberately selected the teaching and discipline of the English branch of the Church, rejecting on the one hand the ritual and doctrines of Romanism, and on the other the teaching of the various Protestant sects of England and America. And having made this deliberate selection, he has formally applied to England—to the Church and the State of England—for assistance. Nor has assistance been held back. The English bishops (we would we could say unanimously) furthered the scheme—a man was found (for who could refuse in such a cause?) who was willing for Christ's sake to relinquish his country and his sovereign, and become the inhabitant of a foreign land, the subject of a foreign monarch. He has received the Apostolic commission, and a little time will see him at his post. Here is a real step. The English Church is now become the mother of another national Church.

Were it not for a firm faith in the reality of the grace of the Episcopate, we might well, all of us, tremble at the responsibility thus laid upon a single man. He is to be, so far as any human being can be, the founder of the Church of the Northern Pacific. On him (in a measure) it depends whether the Hawaiian Church shall be a firm or a wavering witness and keeper of Holy Writ. On him it depends whether there the Church's trumpet utter to coming generations a certain or an uncertain sound. On him it depends whether, in the coming struggle, his dusky children be ranged under the banners of Christ or Antichrist. "And who is sufficient for these things?"

Amongst the numerous points which a bishop, entering on a field of labour such as that to which the Bishop of

Honolulu has been called, must have crowding on his attention, it is very difficult to select those which are of the most pressing importance, and to assign to each need of his infant Church its proper place in the long list of matters to be thought out and arranged.

The first and most important thing, many would at once say, is the providing a proper translation of the Scriptures. We hope not to be misunderstood if we dissent from this view. No doubt it is all important that every Christian should have the freest possible access to the written Word of God. But it may well be questioned whether it is proper to place that written Word in the hands of a number of half-civilized and unbaptized men. Is it not needful to feed with milk, and not with meat? The question will settle itself in most cases—for in the diocese of Honolulu the ability to read will for some time be almost confined to the baptized and professing Christians.

The first point for the bishop's consideration we conceive to be this:—how he may best be able to induce the minds of a people, heathen indeed, but well-disposed towards Christianity, and partly Christianized, to desire and to receive that religion, with all its blessings, but with all its duties. To this end he will, doubtless, begin by a careful examination of the national religion and the national customs. It has always appeared to us to be a grave mistake where missionaries have endeavoured to eradicate existing notions of religion entirely from the heathen mind, as a preparatory step to introducing Christianity. Man's religious being will not endure a vacuum. Remove his rude and gross conception of the Deity, without forthwith and *pari passu* bringing in the true God, and the chances are that another idol is put in the vacant place, or, worse still, the man erects himself into the object of his own adoration. The prudent missionary will endeavour to ascertain what parts of the existing belief are true, or founded on truth, relics of the one primeval and universal Revelation, and what mere inventions of man, or suggestions of the Evil One. While he denounces the latter, he will carefully show how the former really tell of the One true God and Father of all, and how all the aspirations of humanity and all the traditions of a Divine dwelling on earth are fulfilled in Jesus the God-man and in Him alone. And so with national customs, which are generally founded on national religion, and invariably deeply rooted in the national mind. These, where in their essence opposed to true religion, must of course be eradicated—their relinquishment must be one of the painful tests of true conversion; but those which are not such must be borne with, and if possible diverted to good. That may well be tolerated in the volatile and half-civilized child of the tropics which would be intolerable in the phlegmatic Anglo-Saxon; and we must be extremely careful not to lose sight of that precept of our Master which bids us put new wine into new bottles.

Meanwhile we may be assured that the bishop and his clergy will not be slow to use their utmost diligence in acquiring an insight into the language of their adopted country. A mere superficial acquaintance with it will not be enough; they must have a real thorough knowledge of it, a mastery over its peculiarities, and its colloquial usages and terms, that they may be well qualified to go on with their work. It is impossible to overrate the importance of this point. Many a word and phrase in a foreign language which would seem at first well-suited for the purposes of the missionary, turns out on a closer examination to be polluted by some heathen allusion, or to have acquired some shade of meaning which would entirely destroy its fitness. And the exact weight and import of words must be well-considered and discussed. The misuse of a single word now might plunge a Hawaiian Synod into involuntary error a century hence. It must not be forgotten how a mistranslation of the letter of Pope Leo I. on the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon caused the Armenian Church to reject them, and by rejecting what appeared to be an error, to fix on herself the stigma of heresy.

The Hawaiian language, like all its congeners of the Malayan or Polynesian family, is soft and smooth in its

pronunciation, but poor in combinations of sound, and, naturally enough, not very copious in its vocabulary. For many ideas which the Christian teacher will have to present to the mind of his catechumens appropriate words must either be carefully sought and adopted, or judiciously coined, and in such a manner as to be generally intelligible.

The first step towards rooting Christianity in the land may then be made by the careful composition of short accounts of the acts and words of our Lord and His disciples; taken of course from Scripture, but simply stated, and expressed, as far as may be, in the style of their popular traditions. These will be taught orally, and committed to memory. Hymns too, on the model of the native popular songs, may be composed and taught; the greatest caution however being used lest the form or rhythm adopted should be one which has been employed in an evil service, or be calculated to remind those who hear it of any of the wanton and horrible songs which are too often found to be favourites with uncultivated heathen. Not only as regards the diction of these hymns, but as regards their theology, the greatest care will have to be exercised. They will form the staple and basis of the popular belief. A careless statement, or an inaccurate phrase, in one of them, may imbue the whole Church of the next generation with a melancholy error, and one well-nigh irredeemable.

By this time we may well expect that candidates for admission into the Church will have presented themselves: some with every appearance of sincerity; some with the reverse; many apparently of doubtful mind, wishing, perhaps, to follow Christ, but scarcely yet willing to give up all for His sake. A discipline will be needed. How long are catechumens to remain in the state of probation, before they are admitted to baptism? What test of their sincerity must they undergo? How are they to be distinguished from the baptized on the one hand, and the unbaptized on the other?

There are many other questions of the deepest interest upon which we cannot enter here. Meantime let us bid the Bishop "God speed."

The time may come when the faith which shows signs of failing elsewhere may be recruited in the far-off islands of the West, and the Church of Hawaii be a steady witness to the Divine Word, to Catholic truth, to godly order, to the doctrine and fellowship of apostles, of martyrs, of confessors, and of saints.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

JUNE 26.—French Legitimist Congress at Lucerne, 3,850 Legitimists said to be present. Passport system between Italy and England abolished.

June 28.—Successful assault of Confederates, June 14, on the right flank of McClellan's army before Richmond.

June 30.—Paris, June 29.—General Lorencez, after the check at Puebla, May 5, retreated, after some hard fighting, to Orizaba.

Incendiarism in Russia, in S. Petersburg, and other principal places.

July 1.—Private marriage at Osborne of her Royal Highness the Princess Alice with Prince Louis of Hesse, the Archbishop of York officiating.

Revenue returns for year ending June 30, 1862.

	Increase.	Decrease.
	£	£
Customs	250,000	—
Excise	—	1,445,000
Stamps	191,775	—
Taxes	18,000	—
Property Tax	—	1,874,000
Post Office	135,000	—
Crown Lands	4,432	—
Miscellaneous	542,488	—
Totals	1,141,695	3,319,000
Net Decrease	£2,177,305	

July 3.—Turin, July 2.—Recognition by Russia of the Kingdom of Italy.

Ballot division in the House of Commons—ayes 126, noes 211.

July 4.—New York, June 23.—Battle near Charleston, June 16; heavy loss on both sides.

July 5.—Warsaw, July 1.—Attempt on the life of the Grand Duke Constantine.

July 8, 9, 10.—Church Congress at Oxford. President, the Bishop of Oxford.

July 8.—Sir Morton Peto withdraws his Burials' Bill.

July 9.—Defeat of Clergy Relief Bill in House of Commons; 98 to 88.

July 11.—New York, June 28.—Defeat of the Federals near Charleston.

New York, June 30.—Defeat of the Federals before Richmond.

July 12.—Return of Conservative candidate for Montgomeryshire; 1,269 to 959: majority, 310.

July 14.—Peace meeting at New York.

July 16.—The Montenegrins defeat the Turks, July 12.

July 17.—The Turks defeat the Montenegrins, July 14.

New York Times allows that there is no room to doubt that the Federal army has met with a very serious reverse, and is in a condition of peril.

The three French princes quit the Federal army, July 1.

Indian revenue—

Years.	Revenue.	Charge.
1860-61	£42,903,000	£46,924,000
1861-62	42,911,000	43,506,000
1862-63	42,971,000	43,255,000

July 21.—New York, July 4.—Battles on the Chickahominy, beginning with Wednesday, June 25, and continuing every succeeding day till Tuesday, July 1. Defeat and retreat of the Federals, with great losses of men and stores. General McClellan's head-quarters twenty-five miles from Richmond. Proposed call for 300,000 men on the Federal side answered very slowly.

July 22.—Turin, July 18.—Recognition of the Kingdom of Italy by Prussia.

July 26.—New York, July 16.—Some further successes of the Confederates. July 12.—The Senate passed the Confiscation Bill by 27 to 13. It gives the Confederates sixty days to lay down their arms; after that makes perseverance in rebellion treason, with penalty of death, and confiscation of all property, including slaves. The President to have power of pardon, or of passing the minor sentence of five years imprisonment and fine of \$10,000.

Reported defeat of the Turks by the Montenegrins, July 19.

REVIEWS.

The Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association.

NUMBER of persons, lay and clerical, whose respectability we have no desire to question, have lately formed themselves into an association under the above singular title, for the purpose of sending "gratuitously to every member of each of the two Houses of Parliament and Convocation respectively, and, if possible, to every clergyman in the kingdom," a reprint of an article which appeared in the January number of the *Edinburgh Review* last year. The divines of the *Edinburgh Review* have never, as far as we know, been celebrated for any profound acquaintance with Church history; nor does this writer seem to attach more importance to the accuracy of his statements than his predecessors. And really the article, as far as its own merits are concerned, might well be left to the oblivion which was pretty

sure to have been its fate. But when an association is formed of persons who give their names and their money for the purpose of circulating such a document, it seems desirable that the public should know, what those who undertake to remodel our Church and reform our Liturgy, consider to be deserving of the attention of the best informed and most influential classes in Church and State. The limits of this paper, however, must restrict our remarks to a single point,—the observations this reviewer has made on our Baptismal Service.

The reviewer states his case in these terms:—"That the Church of England has overloaded the Sacrament of Baptism, or left it overloaded, with requirements and definitions and dogmas which offend the judgment and repel the sympathy of vast numbers of pious, thoughtful, and reasonable Christian men, is an assertion which needs no proof to support it." And he further adds, that this fact "is above all else the cause at this moment of that dissent which (as he chooses to say) is computed to have involved nearly half the English nation." We are not concerned now with the exposure and refutation of the several parts of this sweeping assertion.

Let us look at the particular points in the Baptismal Service to which this reviewer objects and his statements regarding the mode in which it was compiled.

1. First, he objects to "the consecration of the font, reintroduced," he says, "into the Service-book in 1662." By "consecration of the *font*," we must suppose, is meant the consecration of the *water* in the font. And our first observation is, that it is not true that this prayer was introduced, or reintroduced, in 1662. The history of the prayer is this. In the Offices in use before the Reformation the water in the font, being once consecrated, was never changed until it became corrupt. This form of consecration Cranmer did not retain. But, in the Prayer-book of 1549, he ordered that the water should be changed once a month; and that, before any child should be baptized therein, certain prayers should be said, consisting of two Collects, and some short prayers between them. These prayers were not taken from the Roman office (except the first sentence of the second Collect), but drawn up by Cranmer and the other commissioners. However, most likely to avoid giving encouragement to the Romish doctrine, the prayer of Consecration was, in the revision of 1552, altered, and introduced into the service itself, and ordered to be said every time the Sacrament was administered. Cranmer's doctrine of the Sacraments is very plainly expressed in his answer to Gardiner (book III. vol. iii. p. 281, ed. Jenkyns):—"The change is in the use, and not in the elements kept and reserved, wherein is not the perfection of a sacrament. . . . Water in the font or vessel hath not the reason and nature of a sacrament, but when it is put to the use of christening; and then it is changed into the proper nature and kind of a sacrament, to signify the wonderful change which Almighty God by His omnipotency worketh really in them that be baptized therewith."* With this view the prayers were introduced into the Baptismal Service itself in 1552; and there they have ever since remained, without any alteration; except that in 1662 the words, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," (language borrowed from the second Collect at the beginning of the service,) were inserted in the prayer of Consecration, and the words, "Grant that all Thy servants that shall be baptized therein," (which were more in harmony with the old rule of consecrating the water once a month,) were altered into, "grant that this Child now to be baptized therein." Both these alterations are in perfect accordance with the doctrine of our Reformers. And this was still further guarded, in 1662, by the introduction of the Rubric directing the water to be renewed previous to every administration of the sacrament. However, it is quite clear that this reviewer is mistaken in saying, that the consecration of the font (as he calls the prayer) was *reintroduced* into the Service-book in 1662, for the simple reason that it had never been omitted.

* We are not to be understood as adopting this statement of doctrine.—Ed.

2. The second point the reviewer objects to in our service is "the application of the term *regenerate* to infants after, and by virtue of, their baptism; but, most of all, the expressions which forbid that term to be understood of a simple transference into a privileged state." And, in particular, he desires that the clergy should no longer be required to use the thanksgiving after baptism, stating, in a note, that "it was not till the revision of 1662 that this thanksgiving was made a necessary part of the Private Office." And he further adds:—"It is peculiarly objectionable to the opponents of baptismal regeneration, as involving the assertion, '*It hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit.*'"* But why not say at once, plainly, that the parties for whose gratification the baptismal service is to be altered disapprove of the English Reformation and dissent from the doctrine of our Reformers? However, if we are to obliterate from our Liturgy that doctrine which our Reformers believed to be part and parcel of Christianity itself, we must set to work in good earnest. We must blot out the declaration, that "It is certain, by God's Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." We must blot out of the *Hemily on Salvation* the statement of Cranmer, that "infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this Sacrifice [of Christ's death] washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children and inheritors of His kingdom;" to say nothing of the words of the Catechism, in which the same doctrine is stated in almost the same words. All this must be altered; for to persist in stating that these infants are undoubtedly saved, are washed from their sins, brought into God's favour, made His children and heirs of His kingdom, while we hold it to be uncertain—not to say untrue—that they have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit in their baptism, would be absurd. Nor can we stop there. We must erase from the Nicene Creed the article of "one baptism for the remission of sins;" we must blot out the article of "the forgiveness of sins" from the Apostles' Creed. And when all this is done, it may be considered whether, by the help of a little ingenious criticism and a few nicely-manipulated Various Readings, we may not be able to remove from the New Testament also some passages which, do what we may with the Prayer-book, will still, if suffered to remain, require a vast amount of explanation and non-natural interpretation to bring them into anything like a comfortable harmony with the views of our Liturgical revisers. Meantime let us observe that both this "peculiarly objectionable" thanksgiving, and the preface with which it is introduced—"Seeing now, dearly beloved, that this child is regenerate, &c."—are purely Protestant forms. They are not found in any of the ancient offices. They are not found in Herman's Liturgy, for which this reviewer has an admiration which, we strongly suspect, is not founded on any intimate acquaintance with its contents. Nor are they found even in the first English Prayer-book of 1549. They were added by our Reformers in 1552. And now those who do not understand the doctrine of our Reformation, wish to banish them from our service; or, at least, to allow the minister to omit them—a liberty already taken by some who are too scrupulous to use them, but not so scrupulous as to hesitate to violate the promises and engagements of their ordination. But though written by the Reformers, the reviewer reminds us, that it was in 1662 this "peculiarly objectionable" thanksgiving was first made necessary in private baptism. Very true; and no less true, that the intention of those who then enforced its use was, to impress on the minds of all concerned this fundamental doctrine of our Church, that the spiritual effects of Baptism are not to be attributed to any particular prayers, which may be prescribed in order to give greater solemnity to the administration of the sacrament—prayers which may, and do, differ in different Churches—but simply and solely, to the institution of baptism by Christ Himself. The minister is directed to use "as many of the collects as the time and present exigence will allow." But if the danger and ne-

* The italics are the reviewer's.

cessity should admit of nothing more than pouring water on the infant in name of the Holy Trinity, then is the minister required to recognize the divine institution and sacramental efficacy of what he has done by offering up this thanksgiving, which, whatever may be said or thought of it by the "Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association," was most undoubtedly intended by our Reformers as a very decided and explicit development of the doctrine of the Reformation, as they understood it.

But this thanksgiving was first prescribed in private baptism in 1662. What if it was? The form, at this moment, is precisely as Cranmer left it. If the child survives so as to be received into the Church, the minister certifies to the people that the child, having been "born in original sin and in the wrath of God, is now, by the laver of regeneration in baptism (namely, private baptism, at which, from apparent exigency of danger, there may have been no time for anything beyond the mere words of institution), received into the number of the children of God and heirs of everlasting life." And after the gospel, he prays, not that the child may be born again, as in the form of public baptism, but that, having already been born again, he may be enabled to persevere. Such is the doctrine of our Reformers; and it is really most painful and irksome to be obliged to expose such ignorance, in persons who presume to advise us, how to remodel those services which are the glory of our Church and Reformation.

3. But the reviewer regrets that our Reformers did not "adhere more closely" to the Liturgy of Herman of Cologne, "from which they have already drawn very largely." "Very largely," indeed, did Cranmer make use of that work. The rubrics and collects in our Baptismal Service are all, with very little alteration, taken from that Liturgy. So likewise are the exhortations, addresses, and questions to the sponsors. The exhortations in Herman's Liturgy are longer. But there is very little in ours which may not be found in his. But would not any one imagine, from this reviewer's mode of writing, that our Reformers had put the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration more strongly forward than Herman had done? Otherwise, why regret that they did not "adhere more closely" to his services? Nothing, however, can be more contrary to the truth. Take such passages as these in Herman's Liturgy, and it is easy to multiply them:—"God worketh in us, mortifieth the old man, and repaireth the new, though not after a visible sort, yet by the virtue of Baptism, through the word and the Spirit." "Because the Lord Himself commanded us to baptize, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, undoubtedly God Himself baptizeth our infants, cleanseth them from sins, delivereth them from everlasting death, putteth upon them His own righteousness, and giveth them life eternal." "He Himself calleth this Sacrament the Laver of Regeneration, whereby He maketh us His own sons, heirs of everlasting life, and partakers of all His benefits, &c." And in the prayer immediately before baptizing the child:—"Let it be Thy pleasure to beget our infants again, and to adopt them into sons, unto the fellowship of everlasting life, by the Sacrament of Baptism." And although Cranmer did not take the "peculiarly objectionable" thanksgiving from Herman, we apprehend that the words prescribed by Herman to be said immediately after baptizing the child, would not be more satisfactory to our Liturgical revisers. "The Almighty, Everlasting God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten thee again with water, and the Holy Ghost, and hath forgiven thee all thy sins, confirm thee with His grace unto everlasting life." Again, although Herman's Liturgy prescribed no form of thanksgiving in the Office of Private Baptism, he directs the minister, as soon as he has baptized the infant, to exhort the persons present "to determine certainly that the infant, whether he live or die, is the son of God, and heir of everlasting life." And further, if the child should be in such danger of death that they cannot stop to procure a minister, they are to say the Lord's Prayer, and baptize the child themselves, "which done, let them not doubt

but that their infant is truly baptized, washen from sins, born again in Christ, and made the son and heir of God, let them give thanks to God for this His so great benefits, &c." It may be fairly presumed that any thanksgivings framed on these suggestions our reviewer would consider "peculiarly objectionable." However, when the infant, if it should survive, is brought into the church, this is the prayer Herman directs the minister to offer:—"Lord God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hast begotten again this infant of water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given him in Holy Baptism remission of all sins, confirm the same with Thy grace, and guide and further this new life which Thou hast given, and finish it up whereunto Thou hast bound this infant with this Holy Sacrament."* There is certainly nothing stronger than this in our service. But if Cranmer had inserted this collect into the Service for Private Baptism, we suspect our reviewer would even still have regretted that he had not "adhered more closely to the beautiful service" of Archbishop Herman; so plainly is he unacquainted with its contents.

4. But let us hear our reviewer:—"From the very first a warning voice was raised on this matter. Martin Bucer, the large-minded Lutheran, the chosen counsellor of the English Reformers, in his treatise addressed to Archbishop Cranmer on the English Service-book, strongly recommends an alteration in most of these points, and especially in the engagements of the sponsors, warning him that a departure here from the gravity and simplicity of Christian truth leads, and will lead, men to reject infant baptism altogether." And in a note he refers to Bucer's *Censura*, as it is called; at the same time stating that the criticisms in that work "are directed against the first Baptismal Office of Edward VI. (1549), which contained exorcism and other things, and that they produced some effect upon the Second Prayer-book, published (1552) after Bucer's death. But," he adds, "the alterations then made still fell short of what Bucer urged; and as the Office now stands, it remains even more obnoxious to his remonstrances." What this can mean it is useless to attempt to conjecture. But, as far as these statements are intelligible, they are either untrue or not at all to the reviewer's purpose. First, he says that the *Censura* "strongly recommends an alteration in most of these points;" namely, the consecration of the font, the use of the term *regenerate*, the expressions which forbid that term being understood "of a simple transference into a privileged state," and "the language which is put into the mouths of the sponsors." It is very painful to be obliged to say so, but the most charitable supposition is that this reviewer has never read the *Censura*. If we could believe that he had, we should be obliged to write in very severe terms indeed of such extraordinary misstatements. For with regard to that which is plainly the most important, and is no less plainly the point on which the reviewer is most anxious to make an impression unfavourable to our Reformers and our service, so far from the *Censura* objecting to our use or application of the word *regenerate*, there is not a single syllable of the sort in the work. On the contrary, no one can read it without seeing that the writer believed the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as firmly and fully as it is taught in our services, or in any other. He objected, indeed, to the form of consecration, and the form was considerably modified, as we have seen, in 1552. He objected to the engagements of sponsors, namely, to the questions being addressed to the child himself, as if the child could understand the question. In the revision of 1552 this was altered in the service after private baptism into, "Dost thou in the name of this child renounce the Devil, &c." And a similar alteration was made in 1662 in public bap-

* This collect is (with little alteration) the same as was appointed by Cranmer to be said at the anointing of the child. That ceremony was omitted in the revision of 1552. The beginning of the prayer, however, is still found in our Confirmation Service, precisely where Cranmer had originally appointed it to be read in the Liturgy of 1549, and where it has ever since remained. It is in fact taken from Luther's Liturgy.

tism. So that how the office as it now stands is "even more obnoxious to his remonstrances," as this reviewer says, we cannot imagine. However, after all, it is totally uncertain whether this *Censura* had any effect whatever on the revision of 1552. There is not a shadow of proof that Cranmer ever read a line of it.* It is, to say the least, extremely doubtful whether Bucer, after all this flourish about "the large-minded Lutheran, the chosen counsellor of the English Reformers," was the author of the book. It was not published till more than twenty years after his death. Cartwright, in his controversy with Archbishop Whitgift, has more than once questioned its authenticity. And indeed there is internal evidence quite sufficient to justify the doubt. For several (five out of the eleven) points objected to by the *Censura* as faults in our service, are also found in Herman's. And we have it on the unquestionable authority of Melancthon (Ep. 75, lib. iii. col. 546, Lond. 1642) that the baptismal office in Herman's Liturgy was written by Bucer himself.† But be that as it may, why any Lutheran, large-minded or small, should object to our doctrine of the spiritual efficacy of baptism, it would puzzle any one to conjecture. It is, indeed, to be lamented that this reviewer did not take a little trouble to investigate the truth of the statements he has made so confidently. But history seems not to have engaged much of his attention; if it had, we should not have found him endorsing the absurd theory of Bunsen, who, it would seem, ascribes the origin of the Quakers and the Baptists to our baptismal service, a solution only to be paralleled by the celebrated connection between Tenterden Steeple and the Goodwin Sands.

5. But by far the most mischievous of the misstatements of this reviewer is that by which he accounts for our Reformers having left our service in a state so different from what he and the Liturgical Revision Association would desire. He says, "The necessities of the times forced them to retain much of the familiar Roman offices;" which, if it mean anything, is intended to convey the impression, that we should not have found the doctrine of baptismal regeneration so much insisted on in our service, had not the Reformers been compelled by circumstances, to abstain as much as possible from altering the offices in use before the Reformation. It is scarcely possible to imagine a more complete misrepresentation of fact. For in the first place, looking now at the Prayer-book of 1552, there is not a single prayer or address in the baptismal office retained from the older forms. Even the second collect (and a most beautiful collect it is), though the original is in the Salisbury office, was in reality taken by Cranmer, with alterations and improvements, from the Liturgy of Herman, or rather, to speak more accurately, from that of Luther. There is no part of the Prayer-book which retains less resemblance to the Romish offices than the Order of Baptism. In fact, the truth is precisely and emphatically the reverse of what this reviewer states, and what this ill-advised Association are circulating through the country. The grand distinction between our baptismal office and the Roman is precisely this, that our Reformers have taken great pains to place in the most prominent point of view the spiritual and mysterious meaning and efficacy of baptism, which in the Roman office had been almost wholly kept out of sight. The service had been overloaded with such a multiplicity of ceremonies, that the Divine institution itself was the least important part of the service. But this statement of the reviewer is doubly incorrect. For every line of what our Reformers have introduced

into the service proves, that their intention was to bring back forgotten truths, to restore the Sacrament to its just place in the reverence of Christians; to teach them to look in faith to the hand of God, as stretched forth, in the Sacrament and through the Sacrament, to give their infant children "that thing which by nature they cannot have." Any one familiar with our Reformers' writings, and especially with those of Cranmer, will know, that the effect of Romish doctrine had been to depreciate the value and effects of Baptism, in order to exalt the Mass at its expense. And, consequently, one very principal object Cranmer and his brethren had in view, in constructing this office, was, to bring back the people to that high estimation of baptism which they had almost totally lost, and to teach them to regard it as the Reformers believed Christians are taught to regard it in the New Testament.

But all this is now to be exploded and abandoned; and "the Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Association," or the Edinburgh Reviewer, if they can only prevail on the English nation to adopt their notions, will construct a service from which all these spiritual hopes and consolations shall be carefully weeded out. All we can say is, that it was not by such principles of "Liturgical Revision" Cranmer was guided, in constructing those formularies which are, at this moment, the greatest blessing mankind have ever received, next to the Bible. "We are desirous," said the great archbishop, "of setting forth in our Church the true doctrine of God, and have no wish to adapt it to all tastes, or to deal in ambiguities; (*nec volumus cothurnos facere, aut ambiguitatibus ludere.*)" Church Expansionists and Liturgical Revisers indeed will, if they are suffered, destroy what the Reformers laid down their lives to secure to us. But those who believe, or rather know, that it is the Divine truth of the Gospel itself which is objected to by these mistaken and misinformed men, will resist every attempt of the sort, and will defend the Book of Common Prayer with that religious veneration, which becomes men who are sensible how sacred a deposit they are guarding, and how inestimable a treasure they have to hand down to their children's children.

Nor was it the design of the Reformers merely to insist on what, in common with the Lutherans, they regarded as the true nature and efficacy of baptism. Their object—as any one will see who reads the service with ordinary attention—was, to give the most edifying, the most consoling, the most affectionate view of this holy Sacrament to the people; to fill their minds with sentiments of hope and joy in the contemplation of the good-will of the Almighty to their infant children, of the tender love of their Redeemer embracing them with the arms of His mercy, favourably allowing and approving the charitable work of His Church, in bringing these little ones to receive the benediction of His heavenly washing. It was not as a cold, and dry, and formal enunciation of a dogma, that our Reformers taught the loving parent to believe, that his unconscious babe was regenerated and washed from sin in that mystical water. They did not construct their phrases, and balance their words, and disguise their meaning with "hypothetical" evasions, so as to create in his trembling soul the doubt, whether all might not be a delusion; whether, with all this language of heavenly kindness and comfort, possibly his child might not have been destined, before the world began, by an irrevocable decree, to everlasting wickedness, and misery, and despair. Their object was to kindle the gratitude of Christians to the Author of their mercies; to teach them to look on their children as the children of God; and so to impress on their minds a just sense of their own responsibility, and of the obligation laid on them by the Divine goodness, to teach their children to lead the rest of their lives according to this beginning. And let Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision Associations and Edinburgh Reviewers say what they will, we most firmly believe, as we most thankfully acknowledge, that if there be any one thing whatever more than another which, by the Divine mercy, has helped to make the English character what it is, and to raise the English nation to the place it

* That Bucer did write some remarks on the Prayer-book which were sent to Cranmer appears from the letter of Peter Martyr to him, printed by Strype in the appendix to his life of Cranmer. But whether these are what we now find in the *Scripta Anglicana* is anything but certain.

† When Melancthon says that Bucer composed that part of Herman's Liturgy which related to Baptism and the Lord's Supper ("legi de cæramoniis baptismi, et cœnæ Domini, quæ ipsa composuit") we are not to understand that Bucer was the author of the whole. Of parts of the office he seems to have been; but other parts he took from the Nuremberg form, which was itself taken from the office drawn up by Luther.

holds among mankind, it is this, that the book which our Reformers left us, teaches us to regard our children as the children of God, and the heirs with us of the blessedness of His immortal kingdom. This is the foundation of all our family religion. It is the fundamental principle of all our education, from the humblest village school to the university. It is the spirit of our laws; and even the most lost and abandoned criminal is regarded and treated by all who know and feel the spirit of our offices as a son still, far as he may have wandered from his Father's home. There is not a feeling, a principle, a law, an institution, we possess into which the spirit of our Baptismal Service is not infused. Long distant may be the day when the clergy, the legislature, or the people of England, can be induced to alter, by a single word, that which is the charter of our happiness as men, and the foundation of our greatness as a nation.

The Threefold Nature of Man, as revealed in the Scripture History of Creation.*



THE importance of the scientific knowledge of any subject is to be estimated not merely by the additional interest which it imparts to it, but still more by the facilities which it affords for the prevention and detection of error. A consistent and harmonious theology is the best defence against the plausibilities of heresy. It is a standard to which they can be at once referred; it is a system in which every portion of revealed truth must find a place; and it is a true Ithuriel's spear which compels error to appear in its real form, by discovering its want of harmony with the circle of Christian doctrine. Theology, however, in the proper sense of the word, is not the only science for which materials are afforded in the sacred Scriptures, nor is it the only department of truth in which it is possible to go astray. In the Western Church especially, heresies have been far more commonly of an anthropological than of a theological character, and the disputes which have arisen have had more frequent reference to the nature of man than to the more transcendental questions of the Divine nature and attributes. It is enough to note, what all must have in mind, the Pelagian and Augustinian controversy, that between S. Bernard and Abelard, and that between the Jesuits and Jansenists. We spoke last month of the importance of a knowledge of the Biblical doctrine of the nature of man. Much might be added in confirmation and illustration of our remarks. It will be better, however, to let the subject speak for itself, especially as it will save space and time. What we propose, at present, is to examine, with the assistance of the works quoted below, the Scriptural teaching of our threefold nature as it is disclosed in the history of creation.

In taking our stand upon the authority of the Scripture narrative and the objective reality of the facts which it records, we are occupying the position to which reason itself compels us. We do not even seek to defend it, as we are addressing those who wish to know, not whether the Bible be true, but what it contains on this particular subject. Even an intelligent observer of nature like Aristotle could see that, after passing beyond the mere material form, there were various grades of life, the vegetable, the animal, the rational; but the Scriptural account† of the creation draws aside the curtain and permits us to see the process by which the various parts of man's nature were brought into existence, and in doing so teaches us something of their mutual relations. There is a peculiar solemnity in the manner in which the inspired historian

speaks of the creation of man. It is nowhere said of any living creature but man that he was made in the image of God; but apart from this peculiarity, upon which we cannot at present dwell, the whole account of the formation of the first man and woman is totally distinct from that of the creation of the lower animals. With reference to these, the mere fact of creation is recorded, or we are told that "God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind." But when the crown of creation is about to be added, "God said, Let us make man in our own image;" and then the process of the creation of man is detailed. (*Gen. ii. 7.*)

It may be noticed here, as an instance of the neglect of Biblical Psychology, that when we take up Gesenius's *Lexicon*, in order to ascertain the exact meaning of the different words which occur in the description of the process of creation, we are told that the word נֶשְׁמָה (*neshmah*), here translated *breath*, and the word רוּחַ (*ruach*), the commonest word in the Old Testament for *spirit*; mean, among their other significations, the same as נֶפֶשׁ (*nephesh*), which corresponds exactly with the Greek ψυχή, the Latin *anima*, and the English *soul*. So also in Suicer's *Thesaurus of the Greek Fathers* we find the same identification of πνεῦμα and ψυχή, which is the more remarkable as the Greek Fathers were most careful to set forth the trichotomy of man's nature. It may be safely asserted that such confusion could have taken place only as the result of the neglect of the Psychology of the Scriptures.

When we turn our attention to the seventh verse of the second chapter of Genesis, we find that the three parts of man's nature are not merely mentioned, but introduced in the order of their creation; and it is difficult to say how many errors would have been avoided had these few words been carefully studied. First of all, we find, the *body* of man was made: "The Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground." Man, although the crown and lord of creation, was not to be made separate and distinct from it. He, like the very beasts of the field, was made out of dust. But it is not this fact which chiefly arrests our attention in the narrative. We are struck at once with the refutation which is here presented of the theory which teaches that the body is a mere emanation of the soul and its material self-manifestation. The body is the first part of our nature which is called into being, as if to show that it was very really and truly to be a part of ourselves, and not either a phantasm by which our local presence was to be evinced, or a mere material incumbrance which was one day finally to be shaken off.

The next step in the process of creation is the impartation of a "spirit of life," to animate the newly-formed body and give activity and energy to all its dormant faculties and powers. God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." The word translated *breath*, נֶשְׁמָה (*neshmah*), has primarily the meaning here assigned to it. But the expression employed evidently contains more than an intimation of the commencement of the action of the lungs. These words do tell us that man began to breathe; but they also bear witness to the impartation of a principle of life to the body which had been already formed. This principle of life in man is the highest part of his threefold nature, his spirit. It matters little whether we understand that the sacred historian intends the word translated *breath* to stand for the *spirit*, or what Beck, in explaining this passage, calls the human as distinguished from the animal soul. (*Seelenlehre*, p. 9). Delitzsch substantially agrees with Beck in understanding the word נֶשְׁמָה (*neshmah* = πνοή = *breath*) to be equivalent to רוּחַ (*ruach*), which is the same as the Greek πνεῦμα and the English *spirit*. Hofmann's objection (*Schriftbeweis*, vol. i. p. 286) to Beck's assertion that נֶשְׁמָה represents the human soul as distinguished from the animal is supported by a reference to Genesis vii. 22. We cannot, however, regard his inference from the use of the word in that place as conclusive. In its generic sense it does indeed mean the *breath*

* Beck's *Biblische Seelenlehre*, 1843. Delitzsch's *Bibl. Psychologie*, 1st Ed. 1855, 2nd Ed. 1861. Hofmann's *Schriftbeweis*, 2nd Ed. 3 vols. 1857—1860.

† "Philosophia querit, religio possidet veritatem."—PICUS A MIRANDOLA.

of man or of beast, just as רוח, in its generic sense, means a wind or breath; but just as this latter word, in its more restricted sense, means *spirit*, the spirit of man or of God, and never *soul*, so the word translated breath in its restricted sense means *spirit* and not the *animal soul*. In one passage it clearly has this meaning. We refer to Proverbs xx. 27, where we read: "The spirit of man (רוח אדם) is the candle of the Lord;" in which case we cannot understand either the breath or the animal soul, but the spirit. The decision of this particular point, however, is a matter of comparatively small importance. Whatever may be the exact meaning of the word translated breath, it is evident that the words describe the implanting, by the Almighty Creator, of that which was to be the principle of life to the body, the seat of thought and the fountain of will. And then, we read, "man became a living soul." The body had been formed; the spirit had been breathed into it; and now there was generated, so to speak, the third part of man's nature, *the soul*, which became the connecting link between the spirit and the body.

It must not be supposed that, because Hofmann differs from Beck and Delitzsch in the point upon which we have remarked, he demurs to the general results at which we have arrived. On the contrary, he remarks that רוח and πνεῦμα (רוח is usually translated by πνῆ) are used to express the *condition* of life, or immediate source or support of life (*Lebensbedingung*); while חַיָּה and ψυχή express life which is conditioned (*bedingtes Leben*). These may seem the utterances of a strange tongue to English ears, although we believe they will be found intelligible, after careful examination, even to those who are but moderately acquainted with philosophical terms. The meaning contained in them is evidently the same which has been partly expressed, partly implied in the remarks already made. The spirit is the fountain of life and thought and will and personality in man. In so far as the soul possesses these, it possesses them mediately and derivatively from the spirit. Man's body was first created, but it remained lifeless and soulless,* until God breathed into its nostrils the breath of life and communicated the spirit, which connected humanity with the divine, even as the body of earth had connected it with the lower creation.

It would be easy to illustrate these results from other parts of the sacred Scriptures. Such, however, is not our present business. Commending that portion of the inquiry to the notice of careful students of the Bible, we must conclude with a few additional remarks on the passage on which our previous observations are founded. And it will be noticed how entirely in accordance with our conclusions are the expressions employed in connection with the soul and the spirit. We read of the "breath of life" and of the "spirit of life" and of the spirit which "quickeneth," never of the "living spirit;" and so also we read of the "living soul," never of the "soul of life." We cannot regard Rev. xvi. 3 as an exception; for although Tischendorf and Alford have admitted ψυχὴ ζῶν into the text, on the authority of A and C (the Alexand. and Ephrem MSS), the *Textus receptus* has on its side καὶ ὁ πνεῦμα (the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS), which are certainly of equal authority, and have the universal Scriptural usage in their favour. The distinction implied in these expressions is obvious. The "soul" is "living" because of its union with and dependence on the "spirit of life." The spirit is "quickeneth," because it is the fountain of life to the soul and body. In entire accordance with these conclusions is the remark of Tertullian that "the soul is the body of the spirit, and the flesh the body of the soul." Hence it is that we read of the spirit being renewed (Ps. li. 12; Tit. iii. 5). The soul is not unaffected by such renewal; but it is so through the spirit, as the deepest principle of man's nature. So, also, we always speak of "saving the soul," &c. not of saving the spirit. The

soul, although not the fountain of personality, is the centre of human personality, and that in which man's threefold nature becomes a unity. In that, as their battlefield, the spiritual and carnal meet and conflict. When the *soul* is saved or lost, the *man* is saved or lost.

There are some theories on the subject of man's nature which seem to be in accordance with the teaching of the Scriptures, but which, when carefully examined, prove to be utterly at variance with it. Thus it might seem, at first sight, to be a plausible inference from the Scriptural assertion that God "breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life," that the human spirit is an emanation from the Divine, whereas the Biblical account of the matter is that it was a creation.* It is true, indeed, and it should be remarked, that the history of man's creation teaches us that neither his body nor his spirit was produced by a mere creative fiat, but by the immediate, personal working of the Almighty Creator. Mr. Mansel may remind us that we can have no just conception of the difference which these words express, but we cannot on that account overlook the marked distinction which is preserved in the inspired narrative between the creation of the world and the lower animals and the formation of man. Taking care, then, to give due prominence to the difference between the modes of Divine operation in the different parts of creation, we must also beware of supposing that the human spirit was either an emanation of God, or, as seems to have been the opinion of Origen, a term which is used to denote the indwelling of the Spirit of God in the human soul. Notions like these have led to the un-Scriptural opinion that the spirit of man, as distinguished from the soul, cannot sin. The spirit of man is not only capable of sin, but it is the real source of sin, inasmuch as it is the seat of thought and will. It cannot, therefore, be a mere synonym for the indwelling Divine Spirit. It is endowed with personality, and therefore it cannot be an emanation of the Divine, any more than it can be a mere quality of the being in whom it inheres. The human spirit is not indeed, in the absolute sense of the word, independent, because then it would cease to be a creature; but it is really and truly a personal existence, possessed of life which is derived from God and sustained by His power, and which it communicates to the soul and through the soul to the body. It has, in the secondary sense of the words, "life in itself," while the soul has only a derivative life. The spirit could exist by itself, so far as any created thing can be said to do so; the soul could not exist apart from the spirit, any more than the body could remain organized and perfect after the departure of the life. It was when God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and thus imparted to the inanimate organism the quickening spirit, that "man became a living soul."

Kingsleyism.†



THE name of *Kingsley* has so long since achieved for itself a place of power and fame in the ranks of English literature as to need not a word of praise from us. Mr. Charles Kingsley's position as a novelist is established, whatever it may be as a theologian, or in his more recently-assumed office of historian. Each successive novel has made him more popular and more widely read. Each contained the same unmistakable marks of genius, the same vigour, noble earnestness of heart and purpose, keenness of observation, with the same

* "Nec tu enim, si in tibiam flaveris, hominem tibiam feceris, quanquam de animâ tuâ flaveris, sicut et Deus de Spiritu suo."—TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.* ii. 8. (*Del.* p. 77.)

† 1. *Yeast, a Problem.* By Charles Kingsley, jun., Rector of Eversley. 1841.

2. *Hypatia, or New Foes with an Old Face.* By Rev. C. Kingsley, &c. 1850.

3. *Two Years Ago.* By Rev. C. Kingsley, F.S.A., F.L.S., Rector of Eversley, Chaplain to Her Majesty. 1860.

4. *Ravenshoe.* By Henry Kingsley. 3 vols. 1862.

* See Delitzsch's *Remarks on Hamann*, B. P. (2nd Ed.) pp. 76, 77.

beauty and power of language. People said, and said justly, that there was a manliness, breadth of view, and heartiness about these books, an outspoken frankness and sincerity, that well became an English clergyman boldly drawing a picture of English life for Englishmen and Englishwomen to read—in all of which criticism we cordially join. If a clergyman conceives it to be a part of his mission to write novels—thinking that he can thus speak to the people a message which they ought to hear, and not so well delivered in any other way—he, above all men, is bound to be outspoken, frank, and sincere, full of courage and charity; and, if possessing the gifts of genius and poesy divine, to exert them nobly to the very utmost of his power. This Mr. Kingsley has done with absolute success; and hence arises his reputation as a writer of novels and of sermons, the characteristics of both being in many respects identical. In both we find the same fearless, outspoken earnestness, the same vigour, the same daring handling and application of the words of Scripture, either as weapons of offence or defence, and essentially many of the same doctrines. This was to be expected from a sincere, earnest Christian; boldly proclaiming what he conceived to be the truth, whether to the poor villagers of Eversley or to the more refined and numerous thousands who delight in Fraser and a good novel. We have no intention at present to discuss any of his printed volumes of sermons, or to notice more than incidentally his exposition of “Muscular Christianity.” But there is one broad characteristic of all his teaching in all his novels which, owing to their great brilliancy, beauty, and power of style, has almost escaped notice. To this characteristic our remarks will be chiefly confined; and for this reason we have added to our author’s list of works a novel by his brother, Mr. Henry Kingsley—a place to which it is well entitled by some marks of kindred genius, brilliancy, and power. *Ravenshoe* will, in spite of much vulgar smartness and irreverence, probably be as popular as *Geoffrey Hamlyn*; and all admirers of *Alton Locke* and *Two Years Ago* will give it a welcome. The two authors are not only brothers, but *Fratres fraterrimi*; writing from the very same point of view, with the same strong convictions, with the same dashing, fearless vigour, much of the same love of nature; and, above all, with the one same creed underlying their writing. The author of *Ravenshoe* has not indeed the same power or genius as his (elder?) brother; nor has he yet taken orders. But “his gospel,” as he would say, is the same; and whole pages of the one writer might easily pass muster for the handywork of the other—*Arcades ambo et cantare pares*.

The creed, then, which seems to underlie all these brilliant and amusing volumes is an utter exaggeration of the old saying, “The greater the sinner the greater the saint.” We have great respect for an old saying, and none the less for its being old. Old age is so far a gauge of truth. But *any* saying, whether bran new from Manchester or as old as the hills, may be so strained and exaggerated as to become essentially false. “The greater the sinner the greater the saint” contains as much truth, and is as true, as such general proverbs ever are, when taken in its fair application; but as it appears and as it is implied in these pages it is no better than a lie.

“For truth itself, when robb’d of its own right,
Brings darkness to a man, instead of light.”

We have chosen three of the most striking of Charles Kingsley’s books, and one of his brother’s; and in all these one and the same moral appears most prominent, and most direct where any direct teaching can be found—viz. that the more deeply a man goes down into the depths of iniquity, moral and physical, all the better chance of his resurrection; the greater and more terrible his doubts, the firmer will be, and must be, his ultimate convictions; the more hardened and shameless his unbelief, the better chance for his believing; the more impotent a man is to guide and to control himself, the better fitted will he be to guide others. We are taught to receive this theory as the fundamental principle on which God governs and will judge

the world, and therefore morally true; and as practically exemplified in daily life. Such is the obvious drift of the teaching of these volumes; and every such doctrine we assert to be false in morals, in theory, and in practice.

To prove that this is their real teaching we must examine them more closely. In each story there is a hero—not of the old stock description who inherits all the good luck and sunshine, or, after undergoing unheard-of perils and persecutions, calmly appears at the end of vol. iii. crowned and unharmed—but a hero in the sense of being the cleverest, most brilliant, and amusing personage in the romance, who confutes all reasoners, and kills all dragons, social, moral, and religious; who interests you as you read; makes you love him, and almost forget

“That tocsin of the soul, the dinner bell.”

All the other characters are more or less puppets, and play up to him. They show him off; and play dummy, or straw giant, or Mr. Forcible Feeble, just as the exigency of the plot demands. You remember *him* months after you have forgotten the rest. He, therefore, embodies the main idea, the chief strength and power in the author’s mind; he teaches what the author has to teach, if he *has* any gospel at all; and for that teaching the author is clearly responsible. Let us see, therefore, what the heroes in each story are like, and what they have to say. In *Two Years Ago*, as every one knows, the hero is a Mr. Thomas Thurnall. He is the chief actor, in fact the mainspring, of the whole book. Without him the whole plot and interest of the story would collapse. His career is exciting enough for readers of the fiercest romance. He had been, at the time of his re-appearance in the middle of the story, medical officer to a union; and on board a Brazilian man-of-war; he had seen three visitations of cholera, two of army fever, one of “yellow Jack;” been twice smitten with the first plague, once by the last. He had been in much fighting, in Texas, through the Paris revolution, and in Schleswig-Holstein; and had practised the healing art in every country in the world from California to China. He had five times had bullets in him; once been bayoneted and left for dead; thrice shipwrecked; twice the only man that escaped; he had been fattened by savages for eating; he had been hanged and brought to life again.

Through the whole of this long, wild series of adventure Tom Thurnall passes in a dare-devil sort of rollicking humour, and the only effect it seems to have on him is to convert him into a shrewd, good-natured sort of jolly pagan. We call him a pagan simply because his creed, as it here appears, can scarcely be expressed by any other word. Thus it runs. He knew (we are told) less than Ulysses, and was rather more of a heathen; seeing that he knew not what Ulysses knew, that a heavenly guide was with him. Belief in a better land than this he counts only a dream fit for girls. Having once been born is certainly, he thinks, the best proof of the probability of being born again: he himself was once possibly a Pterodactyle of the Lias, &c. but it was no concern of his. There would be time enough to think of the next life when he got there. Every man would probably go where he ought to go; it would be bad to go where he ought not.

Such is Mr. Thurnall’s character and creed, drawn as far as possible in the exact words of the book before us. He is more than the Hamlet of the play. He succeeds where everybody else fails; in spite of all obstacles, difficulties, and trials. His pluck, good-nature, wit, and success over all dummies and noodles are drawn with great skill, and interest us to the very last; and we leave him with regret. And as it was with hero the first, so is it with Mr. Lancelot Smith, hero the second, in *Yeast*. He, we are told, was one of a set who tried to look like blackguards at Cambridge, and succeeded tolerably in their aim. Short pipes and beer were his constant companions; navvies and fen girls his allies or enemies. He and his friends shot ducks, fought the navvies, slept under turf-stacks, and came home when all the public-house taps were dry. He was an eclectic, full of mesmerism and metaphysics, and in one evening gathered truth successively at a Swedenborgian

chapel, the Garrick's head, and one of Elliotson's magnetic *soirées*. His creed was that he himself was clever; that he ought to be fortunate; that many things were pleasant; that a man ought to be religious. He had found out woman, and turned his knowledge to an account over which a guardian angel is requested to draw a veil. Stamping his foot on the ground, he says:—

"I believe in this, in the earth I stand on; in the things I see. There may be a spirit-world; but if," he adds, "He intended me to think first of the spirit-world, He would have let me see it first; He has given me material senses, *ergo* I use them first, whatever hereafter there be. Wonders *here* are sufficient to occupy me for some time to come."

Mr. Smith's only Bible was Bacon; *he* (Bacon) was right whoever was wrong.

In all essential points, it will be observed, Tom Thurnall's creed and Mr. Smith's are identical. The career of the latter among the fast men at Cambridge was not quite so varied or extensive as his friend's in other parts of the globe; but still as brilliant as could be expected of him under the circumstances, though he had neither been fattened by savages, nor snatched from death by the hangman's cord. He, too, is more than the Hamlet of the play. He "had the longest head and noblest heart a man ever met;" and throughout the whole story is "the guide, philosopher, and friend" to all who most need aid and guidance. His powers of mind are only exceeded by his powers of body. And this is the man, after such a career, and with such a creed as we have seen (over whose moral life a veil is dropped) that the author chooses to be the guide and instructor of Argemone, the heroine of the story. Her portrait is one of great skill and great beauty. Nowhere, perhaps, has Mr. Kingsley drawn a more loving picture of maiden grace and purity. Lancelot Smith is the man, then, to open to this pure heroine "the everlasting significance of the poem of the Odyssey, the unconscious purity that lingers in it, the last rays of Paradise dawn."

The slightest fact in the matter of bone or sea-weed is far more to him than all written books of divinity,—including, of course, the Bible, which is far below Bacon—yet, this man is the teacher, this the instructor of a high-minded, pure, and virtuous girl of blameless life, and heroic death; this is the man to teach her to understand the nature of God's dealings with men, in things relating to the body and to the soul. So much for hero number two.

In *Hypatia*, one of the most powerful of Mr. Kingsley's romances, the scene of which is laid at Alexandria, in the early part of the fifth century, (next to Hypatia herself) the person in whom the life of the story lives, by whom the main motive power is carried on, is one Raphael Aben-Ezra, who combines in his one person many of the contradictory elements that mark the Christian, the Infidel, and the Jew. In character, he is amusing, witty, sarcastic, intellectual and learned; unprincipled and reckless. His creed, much the same as that of Messrs. Thurnall and Smith, may be clearly gathered from his own words:—

"I know nothing," he says, "care for nothing, expect nothing. I can't take the trouble to prick a hole in myself to let out my wits, and see something worth seeing on the other side of the grave, if it be not as stupid as this."

He is not weak enough to believe or to disbelieve any such phenomena as heaven and earth. Why may not a thing be true and false at one and the same time? What harm lies in its being false? What necessity for being true? How is a man better than a dog, or than the fleas on his back? Who knows that the breath of man goes upward, and of the beasts downward? Man is a fallen creature, the flea is not; *ergo*, the *pulex* is better than the man. Who can expect Aben-Ezra to believe in man, he says, while he believes not in God?

Considering that Aben-Ezra, Lancelot Smith, and Tom Thurnall, are some thirteen centuries apart, it is curious to observe the strong similarity of their creed, or, more correctly, their unbelief. If they could but have met about the time of the Crimean war,—in Smith's palmiest days,—we might have had a new system of Neo-Platonism

added to the myriad existing phases of Atheism and dissent from the truth; and a high-priest ready to expound it. As it is, they live in the pages of romance, where each plays pretty much the same brilliant and indispensable part which we have before noted. Each passes through his career of adventure, profligacy, Atheism, and recklessness, to become a hero, a guide, a teacher, and finally to pass into full, sudden, and noble development of all that is greatest and best in human nature. We know of no rational process either in nature or art to which this final transmutation may be compared. It bids such absolute defiance to all the known laws of cause and effect, as to be like nothing but Monsieur Robin's metamorphosis of a plate of dry sand into a living canary.

In Mr. Henry Kingsley's story of *Ravenshoe* we have pretty much the same doctrines enunciated with less power, far less interest, and far less living distinctness of portrait; the main difficulty being to select any characters either of moral worth or principle. Charles, the hero, we are told, *has* some creed about women; but is all but expelled from the university which he adorns with his presence, for rioting and drunkenness. He passes through life with few fixed moral principles, and no religious belief. Adelaide, one of the heroines, is drawn as absolutely worthless. Densil is a profligate "who blasphemes the creed of his fathers and all other creeds;" and yet soon after easily settles down, without effort, into the usual humdrum of respectability. Welter is a consummate blackguard, a bully, and a rake; yet brave as a lion, with nerves of steel; who ends his career with a flourish of trumpets in a most exemplary manner. Hornby, one of the most harmless characters, simply walks up and down the earth to see what mischief he can do. Saltire is a wit and an Atheist; boldly proclaiming his unbelief, always amusing, and the first in the story to do a great action. Lady Ascot has strong religious views, a mongrel variety of Dr. Cumming's, but is made ridiculous in proportion to her belief; and one Mr. Marston is a very dull "double-first" who plays dummy to Charles. In short, the whole story moves on in a strain of bold, dashing, bantering, reckless power, on the assumption that people generally are polite and witty and amusing, unless they happen to be religious, with no particular opinions, unless it be a belief in muscular development,—and that the world is not the Devil's, and things in general are not bad. We take, therefore, the whole drift and teaching of this book, if it has *any*, to be more or less in accordance with that of the other three; and our remarks will apply generally to that doctrine as a whole.

Taken broadly, then, we deny that such books present a true picture of life as it exists, or one likely to be productive of aught but evil if regarded as true. No doubt, such men as Smith and Raphael, Thurnall and Saltire, have existed and will again exist,—just as other mischievous and poisonous creatures. But we deny the teaching and result of their lives to be what is here painted in such glowing colours. The way to Heaven is *not* downward. The way to greater, nobler, purer things is *not* necessarily, or chiefly, if at all, through the mud of impurity, and unmanly degradation. Doubt is not the preparation, either chief or necessary, for the reception and understanding and use of God's noble gifts of faith, and hope, and charity. If so, what becomes of those who have never doubted, but who simply wait and believe, and live on in quiet content to the end with unbroken, unwavering, credence of heart and lip and spirit? Are they to seek teachers in men who have gone down into an abyss at which they themselves shuddered, or who in daring defiance have essayed to scale a height to which they scarcely durst to lift their eyes? Are men who stand firmly on dry land to be taught to use their feet by those who have but just escaped destruction from shipwreck in the hungry waves of doubt and despair? A book that is wiser even than Bacon teaches men that this is not the case; and the whole experience of life confirms what that book teaches. It may be that God will satisfy all honest doubt; but we are nowhere taught that He will satisfy those who urge denial and doubt as the

chief ground for reward. A great thinker of our own age tells us—

“ 'Tis better to have loved and lost
Than never to have loved at all.”

We will go further than this. It is better to have had sight once, if but for a time, and to have lost it, rather than to have been born blind. But, no one in his senses would put out his eyes to reap the advantage of total darkness. There *is* joy in Heaven over one sinner that repents, but we are *not* taught that his repentance is more acceptable or more blessed than the willing service of those who have never gone astray. It *is* never too late to mend; but it is neither wise nor safe to undergo the risk of vicious degradation, or of denial of the truth, for the sake of amendment and recovery. We have no right to assume that a wounded or diseased body when healed is stronger or purer than one which has escaped both the sword and disease.

Granted that there are such men as Lancelot Smith, Raphael, and Tom Thurnall; we deny that their career, their example, or their power as teachers, is here fairly drawn. It is *not* true that they emerge at the end of the tunnel all the braver, stronger, and better for their career. They do not become teachers of singular dexterity, wit, and power; either while in the mud or when they have gained a sure footing. Many and many a man who sets out on such a career as Smith's, with such a creed and such principles, never emerges at all; but is swept away into the depth, and shipwrecked. Such men, as a rule, do *not* rise to the high places of trust and honour, power and happiness among men; nor of acceptance with Him who made men. “Why,” says one who knew human nature well, “why should God take the dry bones when the Devil hath sucked out the marrow?”

The heroes of these brilliant romances contradict the experience of life as we know it, and that truth which the Christian is taught to revere and to defend; they are, therefore, mischievous, and untrue. *Double-firsts*, as far as our limited experience goes, are not the men to be picked out as dull or stupid in comparison with the genius who barely escapes being plucked for his “little-go;” the muscular eclectic who prefers Goethe or Strauss to S. Paul, and can knock down a six-foot “Bargee;” or the poor noodle who counts pale-ale life's *summum bonum*. The coral reef is *not* the safest channel for the good ship that would win the fair haven of peace and truth. The path of repentance is a great and noble one; yet there is a repentance of which it may still be said, *pœnitere tanti non emo*. Our regret is that Mr. Kingsley should in any degree have lost sight of so evident and profound a truth.

One other feature in Mr. Henry Kingsley's story of *Ravenshoe* remains to be noted, and our task is done. That feature is the mixture of slang and irreverence with which his pages are so sadly disfigured. Of the endless attempts at being witty which end only in a sort of feeble, flippant, jocoseness where jocosity is often out of place, we here say nothing. But we protest against all such wanton and intolerable profanity as an allusion to the solemn darkness at the Crucifixion (p. 154, vol. iii.) and the comparison of it to some fog that befalls a wandering profligate in Curzon Street, May Fair. There are many other instances of this wretched defiance of good taste and right feeling scattered through the book, but we select this as the most flagrant and inexcusable. If Mr. Kingsley imagines that to be simply profane is to be witty, the sooner he abjures every attempt at facetiousness the better for himself and for his readers.

Sisterhoods.*



E do not envy the man who can read through this little volume without finding that here and there his eyes do not see quite as clearly as usual. We know nothing of the lady

* *Experiences of an English Sister of Mercy*. By Margaret Goodman. Smith, Elder & Co.

who wrote it, whether Margaret Goodman is a real or imaginary name. But the collection of anecdotes (for it is little more) indicate a mind of sensible, unaffected, practical devotion to duty. And they are full of the deepest interest, as lifting up the corner of a veil which hides from us three phases of life, destined, we are convinced, to occupy a very large portion of the thoughts of the English Church. The life of the English soldier, and that of an English lady under two forms of religious sisterhood. Of brotherhoods we have spoken elsewhere. Sisterhoods require separate consideration. And none, perhaps, but women are capable of justly appreciating the difficulties which surround them, or suggesting the proper method of meeting those difficulties. Of brotherhoods we spoke as an experiment still to be made. Sisterhoods have already been formed, and are now working among us. But we must still be content to remain ignorant, in a very great measure, of those internal experiences which alone can enable us to estimate them rightly. The minds of delicate women devoting themselves to works of heroic self-sacrifice shrink from public notice. And the public eye shrinks from intruding on them. Still more do they shrink from unveiling this hidden life in an ostentatious form—in any form at all, least of all in the form of criticism or condemnation; though, without criticism and condemnation, how can we discover the faults of a system, or learn to avoid them? If life in community be worth anything, it must inspire something of a loyal attachment to it, an *esprit de corps*. And to reveal its defects seems treachery. Perhaps the only mode in which a fair judgment could be formed of the working of the different types of sisterhood now commencing their operations among us would be by private and confidential communication between the bishops of the Church, the clergy who have watched, and the superiors who have directed, and the intelligent and well-regulated minds which have taken part in them. And the inquiry is of the utmost importance. At present we can only venture to speak by *a priori* anticipations. We do not like to lay any stress even upon the occasional insight into their working given in the little volume before us. It gives us a faint glimpse of one form constructed upon a conventual and mediæval type—and of another simple, practical, and business-like, and far more in harmony with the tone of English thought and feeling in the nineteenth century. We have ourselves very decided preference for the latter. We will go further and acknowledge a very decided repugnance to the former. But one great lesson to be learnt by the English Church and the English nation at this day, in all our plans of reformation and improvement, is an honest, true-hearted, and equitable liberality. The English mind, perhaps more than the mind of any European nation, travels in ruts. It is cast into one mould, or rather into one of two moulds. But in either case it is exclusive—rigidly, bigotedly exclusive. It makes no allowance for differences of taste, of constitution, of circumstances. A British traveller applies to every country his own stereotyped conduct of civilization: the *Times* newspaper and his beefsteak. If he misses this, the people are barbarous; a turban or a fez, or a sheepskin coat classes in his eyes a human being like himself under a different species. We have no toleration; our whole mind is as redolent of pipe-clay and regulation-straps as the most obnoxious martinet. But, unhappily, the regulations we enforce are too often not those of any articles of war, but the arbitrary enactments of our own habits, to be enforced by a mob; and until this conceited and fanciful intolerance is abandoned we cannot hope to make any progress in experiments for the benefit of society. Englishmen may have little taste (we have ourselves no taste) for the restoration of forms and fashions borrowed from other climes and other ages. They may dread most justly, watch most rigidly, against the risk of importing, under some foreign contrabandism, the infection of false doctrines. They may decline actively to co-operate with plans which appear constructed on an unsound principle. They may have no sympathy with, nay, rather the strongest

indignation against, the rashness and folly of putting on a red cloak to walk in a field where we are warned there is a mad bull. But in the name of English freedom and Christian charity, in the name of all that we cherish of generosity and chivalry, let us look with the profoundest reverence, and gratitude, and sympathy on tender and delicate women devoting themselves to the service of God and the poor, with the sacrifice of their substance and their lives; bearing what the stoutest hearted men would shrink from; carrying comfort and blessing into wildernesses of sin and suffering created by our neglect; giving to us who are sitting in our comfortable studies and our refined drawing-rooms a glorious example how to take up our cross and follow our common Master. Let us leave to our bishops, not suggest to a mob, the task of watching over such institutions and guarding them from mistakes. Our sympathy, our reverence, and our gratitude will open to us the happiest mode of warning them from error, if errors are likely to be committed. The experience even of failure in such attempts will be an invaluable lesson to ourselves. How many guns must be burst, how many ships dismasted as useless, before we can reach the best type of our cannon and our fleets! Experience is what we want. Let every experiment be tried, be carefully watched, accurately recorded, guarded against dangerous explosions. But let them be tried. It is evident that we are as yet much in the dark as to the right construction of the machinery of sisterhoods, which, nevertheless, we acknowledge to be of infinite value, even necessity. Let each new suggestion have scope and due freedom for its trial. *Παθὲν μαθεῖν*. Even their failure will be our gain, and the errors of the first will become the wisdom of the last.

Another point to be remembered in the discussion of sisterhoods is that, although they are not identical with that re-establishment of deaconesses in England which has been so ably urged by Dr. Howson, and discussed at the late congress at Oxford, (what a progress has already been made in the removal of prejudices on this subject!) still the one must run into the other. Deaconesses regularly appointed and recognized by the Church, trained to their work, associated in ministrations of mercy, whether as visitors of the poor, or nurses, or teachers, and distinguished by a dress, however simple and unobtrusive, will naturally gather themselves under the shelter of a common home. They will be found among the numerous class of educated ladies who have small incomes and no family ties, and for whom families must be constructed. Deaconesses must grow sisterhoods, and sisterhoods must also grow deaconesses. That is, women brought together into any social form of religious life must be employed in practical business-like religious duties. A conventual system formed to train female minds to habits only of devotion, meditation, and prayer, is not and ought not to be contemplated. Mary and Martha are not cases in point. Our Lord's teaching applies to a contrast not between the practical and the meditative religious life, but between the religious and the secular, between the thirst for internal religious knowledge and religious affection and an excess of care and trouble for externals, however needed.

They are not even simply human beings. Their peculiarities as women must be consulted, carefully and reverently consulted, for all that is planned and done must be inspired by that exalted and exalting reverence for woman which is the chivalry of the Gospel. But they must be understood. If a wall is to be built, we must first know whether our materials are to be bricks or stones. May we venture to suggest a few features in the female character which must materially determine the form upon which sisterhoods are to be constructed? 1. Are not women essentially weak, so that they must cling together and lean upon some stronger arm? 2. Are they not naturally disposed to be jealous of each other? 3. Must not, therefore, the authority placed over them be vested in a man? 4. And yet does not the delicacy of their nature require a woman's authority immediately in contact

with them? 5. Do they not throw their whole heart and soul into the two noble but unreflecting passions of admiration and love? 6. Are they not eminently objective, rather than subjective? 7. Are they not formed to feel rather than reason, and to execute rather than originate? 8. Do they not, therefore, need specific direction far more than men? 9. Will they not in love and duty brave and endure things from which the most heroic man would shrink? 10. When they are strict and severe, is not their severity far more cruel than man's? 11. Is not the sense of weakness, of uselessness in the world, one of their great trials? 12. Have they not a keen ambition, and longing for power, and when they possess power do they not abuse it more than men? 13. Have they not a craving to be loved? 14. And has not this weakness been, in more than one instance, seized on by individuals incautiously admitted into sisterhoods, to obtain an undue influence over the head, and so to peril, if not to ruin, the whole institution? 15. Does not the necessarily confined sphere of their duties, the subordination of their social position, and the weakness and delicacy of their nature, busy them with the seemingly little things of life, petty difficulties, trifling interests, as they seem to men? 16. Is not this the secret of that tendency to gossip with which they are charged? 17. Can gossip exist without evil-speaking, and is this danger to be met by the imposition of silence, or by the elevation of the mind to higher thoughts and duties than our neighbours' faults. 18. Are they not more indifferent to food than men, but more dainty—a consideration which has been unduly neglected in more than one sisterhood, and with great mischief as the result? 19. Can we, ought we to extinguish their taste and interest in dress? Is not a woman's dress, like a soldier's uniform, matter of no little importance? 20. When great intellect and the instinct of ruling predominates in a woman, is it not an exception to the general constitution of nature? and can such exceptional minds be safely entrusted with the formation or administration of a practical system, which, to become permanent and universal, must be calculated for ordinary and average minds? We submit these twenty questions to those who understand the female character better than we do ourselves. Some other time we may try to point out a few of the practical applications of them to the internal organization of sisterhoods.

The Astronomy of the Ancients.*

IR GEORGE LEWIS'S learned work has been already so frequently and so favourably reviewed, that we may assume it has also by this time been so extensively read as to render it unnecessary in this notice to occupy any space in giving a preliminary account of its contents. It would also be superfluous to waste time in mere commendations of an author so very well known for his erudition and critical acumen. We shall rather, therefore, pay him the greater compliment of criticising what he has written, in the same spirit with which he himself has heretofore dealt with "the credibility of early Roman History," or, in the work before us, with Egyptian and Babylonian chronology.

The author explains that he has not written his work as a scientific history of astronomy for scientific persons; and, in fact, it appears that he has merely investigated the ancient astronomy at all because of its intimate connection with ancient chronology, and because the latter is the foundation of history. Strictly speaking, then, this is not so much a history of ancient astronomy as another critical work on the *Credibility of Ancient History*, going back, on the present occasion, to a period anterior even to the time when Greek and Roman history was but fabulous and tra-

* *A Historical Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients*. By the Right Honourable Sir George Cornewall Lewis. London: Parker, Son, and Bourn. 1862.

ditionary. Although we have, therefore, in this work, a "survey of the astronomical opinions of the ancients," it is curiously out of place; and, certainly, as far as it is a history, its credibility may be doubted with even greater reason in some respects—and especially as regards the most early periods it surveys—than early Roman history, or the chronology of Egypt, Babylon, and—should we not add—China. In some sense we mean literally that the astronomical survey is "out of place;" for, in the *résumé* of *The Astronomy of the Ancients*, given by Sir George Lewis, he commences, not with the Babylonians and Egyptians, but with the comparatively recent Greeks and Romans. This first part of the book contains a collection of, perhaps, all the allusions to astronomical opinions, facts, or theories, which may be found in all the remains of Greek and Roman Literature from Homer and Hesiod downwards, while in the latter part of the work we are taken back to the chronology of the more ancient Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. In that portion, however, which is by far the largest of Sir George Lewis's work, we have little or nothing whatever about astronomy; and yet it is the only part of the book that is written, as it were, with a purpose, or in which the author appears to arrive at any practical conclusion. It is here we have the final cause of the whole, and a key to the common inquiry, What can have induced Sir George Lewis to turn his attention to astronomy? Sir George has really written his present work to show why he utterly discredits the puzzling historical traditions of the Egyptians and Babylonians. He regards them as unworthy of credit, because "the chronologies differ by thousands of years," and because they have no foundation but "the oral traditions of priests," and the supposed discoveries of modern Egyptologists, who, he says, have a method of reasoning which "recognizes none of the ordinary rules of evidence," and "makes demands upon our credulity almost unbounded." In discarding the much-vaunted hieroglyphical discoveries of modern times, it is to be regretted that he does not go further, and tell us whether he has arrived at definite conclusions as to the probably real chronology of the ancients. But perhaps that would be asking too much. It is something to have pointed out, that what has appeared to be a reality is only a mirage. What is truly to be seen through the mists of antiquity is probably well left for future investigation. We may assume, however, since he rejects the modern faith in the immense antiquity of Egyptian dates, as being merely due to "Oriental exaggerations," like the 80,000 or 100,000 years B.C., also claimed by the Chinese for their "Celestial Empire," that he is inclined to revert rather to the now old-fashioned chronology of Scripture, and that he thinks we have little ground for believing in any chronology of the ancients beyond about 3,000 or 4,000 years prior to the Christian era. Doubtless if any thing plausible can be urged on the other side against this orthodox judgment, Oxford or Cambridge will provide a champion, or they will belie the reputation they are beginning to acquire for defending the newest speculations with "a freedom of thought" which approximates to the "Oriental," alike in its latitude and tenuity.

We have no intention to go into this important question, but will revert to the subject of Astronomy, which gives the title to Sir George Lewis's learned work. It is curious to observe the delicacy of the layman, contrasted with recent writings of some of the clergy who have professed their assent and consent to the 39 Articles of the Church, as regards all reference to the Scriptures touching matters of human knowledge. This may be regarded, perhaps, as what is called an error on the safe side; but we profess we think Sir George Lewis has carried this delicacy too far. We know the bitterness that is easily imported into polemics when they touch religion; but we consider that therefore it is the more incumbent upon men of a truly philosophical spirit to show an example to a petulant age how matters of science or history should be discussed. Besides, we know not how our author could bring his logical mind to quote Hesiod, Homer, and Virgil, as exponents in any degree of the mind of "the

ancients" on astronomy, and omit all notice of the many astronomical allusions to be found in the far more ancient Jewish Scriptures. But this introduces us to a very deep subject, nothing less, namely, than the origin of human knowledge. For let us ask, How can we account for the astronomical puerilities of the ancient Greek and Roman mind as they appear in the works of their poets, contrasted with the superior, and we may almost say scientific, knowledge of the same things, implied in the astronomical allusions throughout the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, except upon some hypothesis of a truer tradition—taking the lowest possible view of the Scriptures, and regarding them simply as Jewish writings—somehow retained among Abraham's descendants, but lost among the Greeks? To say nothing of the cosmogony of Moses—for to speak with honest plainness we know not now whether those who would fain be orthodox are expected to believe with Mr. Rorison—and under the auspices of a bishop of high reputation (who, alas! in these too busy days has neither time to read what he condemns as heresy, nor what he sanctions as a defence of truth!) that the first chapters of Genesis are mere "poetry," with day and night divisions instead of stanzas! or as the less heterodox Mr. Goodwin maintains, as words which ought not to be tampered with, if they be a revelation of God;—let us glance at some of the other references to the earth and the heavenly bodies to be found in Scripture, and see how they contrast, taking them as mere expressions of the popular astronomy of the Israelites, with the extracts from profane poetry furnished to us by Sir George Lewis.

Not only do we find in the Scriptures a total absence of anything like the absurdities of the mythological fables of the Greeks or Hindoos regarding astronomy; but when we even discard these, as perhaps never soberly believed, in all their literalness, by any but the lowest grades of mind even among those where the myths were current, and have regard merely to the notions which may have been entertained as probable physical truth; the contrast is marked between what is contained in Scripture and in profane poetry. We say this, though we do not go so far as Sir George Lewis appears to do, and consider that every allusion in a poem to the earth and stars should be taken literally as proving what was the popular belief respecting their real constitution. Some of his quotations, which speak of "the earth as a level plain surrounded by the ocean," are, perhaps, rather indications of a limited geographical knowledge than astronomical opinions at all; and indeed, some of the other quotations given, as opposed to that opinion, are evidently geographical arguments and not astronomical, as he appears exclusively to regard them. We know that others among the ancients—who may also have regarded the earth as a level plain—believed the sea to be in the middle with land all round, and hence the very name of the "Mediterranean" sea. This view also, doubtless, depended upon local position and limited geographical knowledge; and really when men did not know what was beyond the water or the land on this or that side of them, what else—apart from mere speculation—could they possibly profess to know as rational beings? True, the form of the vault of heaven, the circular appearance of the earth when viewed from elevated positions or from the sea or on level ground, the extension of the apparent horizon equally to the same distance beyond any place to which one might travel in any direction, might all suggest to thoughtful minds the rotundity of the earth and its hanging upon nothing. And, in point of fact, in the very earliest traces given by Sir George Lewis of the deliberate thoughts of men on these subjects, such are indeed the conclusions arrived at. It is not in Homer or Hesiod or Virgil, or the writings of any "poet," nor even in those of general writers on miscellaneous subjects, that one should expect to find the astronomical views even of contemporaries; but only in the works of those who treat of the subject specially. Even in astronomical works the language cannot always be confined to expressions in accordance with the theoretical views of the writers. Not merely do we find them ever and anon making use

of words implying "the earth to be a level plain," and alluding to the sun's "rising" and "setting," in accordance with the natural appearances of things; but sometimes language still less in accordance with their real opinions may be found. For instance, in a highly speculative essay by Professor Kelland in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January of this year, entitled, "The Yard Measure applied to the Stars," may be found the following sentence with reference to the stationary sun:—"But the sun wanders among the stars and rolls round the earth, and thus seems to defy the efforts of the measurer." This almost matches any extract given by Sir G. Lewis from the Greek and Latin poets. When we come to Thales, however, and leave the poets, we at once have a theory of the earth no longer childish. But before Thales what do we find? And this suggests another question, How did Thales obtain—or did he devise—his notion of a round earth suspended in space? Now, it is believed that he learned this theory in Egypt; in short, that he merely transferred to Greece a tradition of astronomical truth retained elsewhere, which not even the subtlety of the Grecian mind enabled it to discover of itself. This consideration throws us back once more upon the further inquiry, whether the Egyptians accomplished of themselves this intellectual feat, which the acute Greeks could not achieve, or whether the Egyptians, also, merely acquired their knowledge as a tradition? We cannot further pursue this question, though it ought to be considered by all who will go deeply into the matter; but will resume the limited consideration of the supposed astronomy of the Greeks, before they were thus enlightened by "the wisdom of the Egyptians,"* and, judging from the astronomical allusions found in their poets, contrasted with similar allusions in Scripture.

We may return to the subject of this book.

The Great Liberal Party.



HE "Great Liberal Party,"—*monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum*,—has been minutely dissected by the author of *The Present Position*.† He has used a sharp knife and a steady hand, and has cut clean and deep. In the process the whole structure and composition of the thing has been laid bare. The result is not pleasant or flattering to the national pride, either of governors or governed; but as it is a good thing for a people to know a little now and then about the impostures practised upon them under pretence of patriotism, and for the English people in particular, to know what curious things are perpetrated on their behalf in the name of "civil and religious liberty," the author has done good service, and deserves to be read not only for the ability, but for the usefulness of his book.

* The Egyptians themselves, on whose early monuments are found all the signs of the zodiac, acknowledge that they derived their astronomy from the Chaldeans. These signs evidently correspond with the imagery in Jacob's dying blessing, and the Hebrew tradition is that he spoke of them as the appointed cognizances of his twelve sons which were borne on the standards of Israel in the wilderness; and the twelve signs and other constellations are connected with prophecies relating to the coming of the Messiah, and traced back by the Jews even to Seth and Adam. The Chaldeans attribute their astronomical science to Oannes, supposed to be Noah. The Arabs and Brahmins, among whom astronomy was early cultivated, probably derived it from Abraham, through Ishmael and the children of Keturah. The Greeks, as we have seen, traced their first real astronomical knowledge to the Egyptians. The Romans are thought to have received theirs from the Etrurians; and they theirs from Assyria; and Hesiod even, who mentions some of the constellations by the names they now bear, is said to have made use of Assyrian records. The mythological fables applied to the constellations are supposed to be corruptions of the true traditions of the divine prophecies which are really recorded and prefigured in the names given to the groups of the stars.

[The substance of this note is extracted from a most learned and interesting work, called *Maxxaroth* (Rivington's), now passing through the press, the first part of which came accidentally into the writer's hands while writing this article.]

† *The Present Position of the Liberal Party*. By the Author of *Miriam May* and *Crispin Ken*. Saunders, Otley, and Co., 1862.

The book is "liberally" abused. This is a tribute to its truth and power. In one respect, indeed, the author has laid himself open to attack when he might have avoided it. He has written so rapidly and down upon his subject, and with such scanty revision, that he is here and there obscure. This remark applies to one or two of the earlier chapters. But this is of the less consequence, both because it is partial only, and because of the construction of the book, which deals in its several chapters with the several heterogeneous elements out of which "the great liberal party" is compounded; and as each chapter is complete in itself, the reader can walk in and out of the book at pleasure, just as if there were no other chapters than the one he is reading. He will find in every one of them more than enough by way of information, and comment, and amusement to make him glad that he has read; and he will dip and dip again, till he has taken up and digested and assimilated the entire book. It is good sound food, and very well and piquantly served up: but here and there the cook has not taken quite pains enough to make some ingredients find their way smoothly and easily over the palate.

If we may advise touching the way of reading this book, we should say begin with chapters iv. v. vi; then go on to x. xi. xiv: after these a discursive dipping; rather a synthetical than an analytical process. But it should all be read, because it is a real whole; though some change may be made for ease and satisfaction in grasping its contents, in the order in which the parts are taken.

Horace tells us that if you pull a great poet to pieces you will find the several pieces, language, matter, style, thought, creative and imaginative power, fit into one another better than into anything else, and make one harmonious and beautiful whole. But what is true of a great poet is not necessarily true of a "great party;" especially is it not true of "the great liberal party." The whole is not harmonious, neither before nor after the disjunctive process. Rather is it a *monstrum*;—it is true it is *ingens*; it is the great liberal party; but *horrendum*, a thing ghastly and alarming to look upon; *informe*—so misshapen and distorted a thing that it is a miracle how the parts ever came together or grew into one another, so as to be parts of the one and the same body: and then its single eye; the one thing there was of light about it—care for the people—this is gone,—*cui lumen ademptum*. Virgil had some experience of the results of the policy of a great liberal party in his day, and sung of it very aptly when he sung of Polyphemus.

There is a compensation in things. Now we have lived to see the worst war of ancient or modern times—the worst under each and all of its aspects. The once United States claimed to be first among the nations, whether of the Old or of the New World, especially in what has misappropriated to itself a very high and honourable name. It is really shocking to think what modern "liberality" is, and above all other American "liberality," or liberalism, compared with what it should be to answer to its name. Well, the Americans being sunk in liberalism, and having drained all its poison to the lowest dregs, thought they were going to out-top the world—"to whip creation"—to use two words of that choice phraseology which has been the only thing to make men sicken at and be ashamed of the English language. All at once the bubble burst, and the very small amount of public virtue and morality existing among their public men was not proof against the trial forced upon them by the downfall of their hopes. So came this unnatural, aimless, and brutal war. In its beginning without one single excuse; in its progress revolting, and breathing nothing so much as the worst spirit of vengeance and extermination. Then men said—and now there are very few in England who do not say it—see what "liberalism" does for a people. It makes them to be so wholly without compass or pilot that when a great trial comes upon them there is nothing in them to command, but everything to alienate the respect and the sympathy of mankind. If then the American butchery—for it does not deserve the name of war—be a dreadful visitation upon humanity at

large, there is at least this compensatory lesson to be learnt from it, that it is not the "liberal party" among a people, however great, which is its best friend. The English people have been apt scholars. They have gotten a wonderful amount of learning in the last twelve months. The "liberal" market is not considered to be safe. The scrip is at a heavy discount. It is terrible to think at what price the true value of this stuff has been ascertained; but no man in his senses will say that even this price has been too high, having regard to the historical importance of exposing unmistakably to the world the real character and extent of American imposture.

At this juncture, then, it is very good to have some parallel account of liberalism in England; some connected comment upon it, founded on facts and documents. The things in the two countries are very like one another; but there is a considerable difference too, originating in, and growing out of, those very institutions which liberalism holds to be its particular vocation to destroy. It is a thankless and not a very wise proceeding to direct all your efforts to the overthrow of those very things which confer upon you all the little respectability you may possess. But so it is with "liberals" all over the world, and so it will be to the end of the chapter. The author of the *Present Position* has helped largely and powerfully to a truer understanding of the case as it stands between "the great liberal party" and the English nation, and we all owe him our best thanks.

Schleiermacher.



HE name and merits of Schleiermacher, as the interpreter of Plato, are generally known in this country. His theology is read by some amongst the students of German literature. The recent translation of his letters has introduced his name to a wider circle, and gained for him new admirers. It is, therefore, necessary to know whether he is a safe guide in religion. Men of opposite opinions in Germany make him the beginner of a new era in German theology, or even the author of the happy movement from infidelity towards faith. Some of the new school of Divinity amongst ourselves regard him with admiration as a perfect exemplification of the possibility of being a devout Christian without believing any one article of the Catholic faith. That he was a great man must be acknowledged by all who know the high position he took in Germany, and held for so many years. He was at once philosophic and imaginative—a sentimentalist and a sophistic dialectician—a profound student and a shrewd and practical patriot—an agreeable companion, equally acceptable to the diplomatist and the man of learning; the friend of Perthes the plodding bookseller, and of the genial Heinrich Steffens, that enthusiastic philosopher of nature and zealous asserter of consubstantiation. A man so endowed was naturally constituted to exercise a great influence in his day and generation. To understand his religious influence it is necessary to remember his early training. His parents, anxious to preserve him from the infidelity of the day, placed him first at the Moravian school at Niesky, and subsequently at their seminary at Barby, to be prepared for the Moravian ministry. But Schleiermacher was naturally of a sceptical turn of mind. At the age of eleven, as he tells us, he had had doubts concerning the Deity of our Lord and His vicarious sacrifice; and at Barby, where, notwithstanding the vigilance of the directors, the literary periodicals of the day found an entrance, his original doubts were revived and irrevocably fastened in his mind. In a letter to his father he declares that he cannot believe that Jesus is the Only-begotten and Eternal Son of the Father, and that he rejects the doctrine of His vicarious sufferings. This confession, of course, terminated his studies at Barby, and caused his removal to Halle. But that peculiar mental constitution which made him take pleasure in the devout sentimentality of the Moravians caused him ever to retain the impression received

amongst them, and that impression was subsequently one cause of his success as a preacher and a divine. That his success was great is undoubted. But that Schleiermacher was the sole or even principal author of the return of so many Germans to the Catholic faith can only be believed by those who think that nothing great in religion or theology can be effected except by a scientific divine, a professor at a university. When Schleiermacher appeared, Germany was like the land of Israel in the days of Elijah. It seemed as if all had forsaken the Lord. But there were some thousands left scattered in various regions who had never bowed the knee to the modern Baal. The university of Tubingen was orthodox in the worst times. Bengel had many followers all over Germany, even in his apocalyptic calculations. In Elberfeld and the Wupperthal, in Bavaria, in Prussia proper, in Silesia, there were to be found among the clergy zealous defenders of the *Unveränderte Augspurgische Confession*, or of the severest doctrines of Calvin. Amongst the laity also were many pious believers in the Faith once delivered to the saints, as, for example, the old Landgrave of Hesse, the devout and self-sacrificing Baron von Kottwitz, Matthias Claudius; and, in Berlin itself, the venerable and devoted Bohemian preacher, Jenicke, kept alive the spark of faith amongst the middle-classes, from the days of Frederick the Great to our own times. When, therefore, the most awful calamities of war and the hard hand of a foreign tyrant fell heavy upon Germany, and crushed its pride, and filled every house, from the palace to the cottage, with sorrow and mourning, and made men seek for consolation which cold infidelity could not bestow, they turned towards those pastors who had something to offer, and went back to their Bible and their old German hymn-book. Then those who had remained faithful in the general apostasy had the joy of seeing their fidelity rewarded by the return of many an erring soul. This was just the time when Schleiermacher's voice was heard, proclaiming the necessity of religion for the educated classes. Neology had left the German heart desolate. Calamity had made it contrite, and conscious of its desolation. Schleiermacher came to tell them how they might be religious without believing the Bible, without renouncing their philosophy, and without returning to the creeds, which they had rejected long ago, and, as they thought, for ever. In his celebrated *Orations on Religion* there was nothing to offend the prejudices of the age. Religion is represented as a sentiment, an affair altogether personal and subjective. He did not ask for faith in Scripture, nor in the Confessions of the Universal Church. He rather protested against it by declaring that such faith was not religion. He did not make Christianity specially prominent, nor exclusively the true religion; but one amongst many. He even suggested the possibility of another and more perfect revelation. He praised Spinoza as "full of religion and the Holy Ghost," and called upon his readers "to join him in offering a lock-of-hair to the manes of the holy, despised Spinoza." Of him, he says, "The infinite was his beginning and end. The universe his only and eternal love. In holy innocence and profound humility he mirrored himself in the eternal world, and beheld that he himself was the eternal world's most loveable mirror!!" (whatever that means). In conformity with this eulogy he so mystifies his readers between God and the universe, and by his objection to a personal God, that their impression is that Schleiermacher's religion was Pantheism, and this opinion is shared alike by scientific divines of the opposing schools. Kahnis and Karl Schwarz both declare outright that he was a Pantheist. Such an advocate, pleading for such a religion, was likely to plead successfully with the educated irreligious of that day. Indeed, his work had a presage of success in the private *Imprimatur* of two accomplished Jewesses, to whom the author previously communicated his manuscript. What pleased them was not likely to offend the prejudices of other rejecters of Christianity. It also was sure of being favourably received by the Romantic school, then a large and energetic party in Germany, being recommended by Frederick Schlegel their acknowledged head. The wonder was how Schleiermacher,

with such sentiments, ever produced any inclination for the simple Christian faith. But this difficulty vanishes when we remember that in his sermons, and dogmatic divinity, he continually speaks of the convictions of sin, the necessity of redemption,—of Christ as the Redeemer, and of the blessedness of the change from a state of nature to a state of grace,—that he treated religion as a matter of personal experience, and affirmed that the believer could give an account of the inward change from the irreligious to the religious state.

His style of preaching also was attractive and impressive. He was philosophic, but also eloquent and fervid. He never wrote his sermons, but studied them mentally, and sketched merely an outline beforehand. His mind, therefore, worked during the delivery; and the ideas, issuing forth hot and fresh, went to the hearts of those accustomed to the embarrassed manner of preachers who wrote their sermons and then learned them by heart. Thus Schleiermacher met both the intellectual tastes and the religious wants of the times, and soon became popular with all classes. Those who had deserted public worship went to hear Schleiermacher. Statesmen, military men, professors, university students, and sentimentalists, male and female, thronged his church. Many were through his preaching convinced of sin and of the necessity of redemption. They interpreted what he said about the Redeemer by the help of their hymn-books, and took all literally in the old-fashioned sense. But when this awakening from godlessness or infidelity was effected, and the subjects of the change began to think, and to study the long-neglected New Testament, they gradually discovered that Schleiermacher meant something altogether different from what they had conceived—that his Christ was not the Christ of the Gospel—his redemption not that which was purchased with the atoning blood of Christ. They found that though sometimes he spoke orthodoxly of miracles, at other times he explained them away—especially the cases of demoniacal possession, which he treated as insanity—denying altogether the existence of the devil. Then they left him and sought out some despised pastor who believed in the Bible. Theological students who attended his lectures, in which there was less reserve than in his discourses *ad populum*, found him out sooner. The publication of his *Glaubenslehre* fully revealed his meaning, and exhibited his religion as something altogether different from the Christian faith. His faith is not that embodied in the Creeds, and does not come from the hearing of the Word of God, but from personal feeling. The Old Testament he rejects as Jewish, and thinks that the doctrine of the Christian Church will never be right until it is altogether got rid of as alien to Christianity. The New Testament, in his eyes, is not an inspired Record of Divine Revelation, but a collection of writings of individuals, who merely give their own views of facts, and record their own opinions and feelings. Their writings are, therefore, of no authority when they disagree with the internal religious sentiment. On this internal sentiment his whole religious system is based. According to this theory man feels that he is a creature dependent upon God. He also feels his sinfulness, and that of the human race. Somehow or other he hears of Christ, through the Church or through tradition, and feels that He is the Saviour he needs. Through Him an internal change takes place. He is delivered from the feeling of sin and guilt, and translated into a feeling of communion with Christ. This is redemption. The consciousness of this change is faith. But then the words God, Christ, sin, redemption, Redeemer, are all used in a sense of his own.

As we have already seen, Schleiermacher's God is not a personal God, nor Creator of the world; for he found it difficult to comprehend a beginning of creation. He is not the God of the Old Testament, for that is totally rejected; nor the Triune God, for the Trinity is absolutely denied. Christ is not the Eternal Son of the Father; for, according to Schleiermacher, He had no existence until He was born, like other human beings, of two human parents, Joseph and Mary. His union with God is the result of

the original law in the production of the human race, according to which God provided that humanity should be capable of this degree of perfection. The eternal provision was realized in the Son of Mary and Joseph; and, therefore, Christ is the archetypal man, was always conscious of the Divine presence, and sinless, and His mind conformable to the Divine mind, but still a creature like ourselves. Redemption is not a deliverance from the curse of the Law, from death and hell, but the change above indicated. Christ's death was not an atoning death, nor His sufferings vicarious. Scripture testimony on this point is simply rejected, not explained away. Christ's resurrection is doubtful, and faith in it not necessary to redemption. The accounts of His ascension are also doubtful, and the ascension not an article of faith. There will be no second Advent, no general resurrection, no general judgment. Even personal immortality is doubtful, and the common belief in it the mere offspring of selfishness, a desire for the continuance of self. The Holy Spirit of the Old Testament is not the same as the Holy Spirit of the New Testament, and could not be, for the latter, being the pervading principle (*esprit de corps*) of the Christian Church, could not exist when there was no Christian Church. Sin is not the result of the fall of Adam, which is only a myth, nor a transgression of the Divine Law, but the dominion of the lower part of our nature over the higher. Redemption the dominion of the higher over the lower. Such is an outline of Schleiermacher's system. Self is the foundation of the whole; and what self does not feel necessary is not to be believed. As self fabricates the whole system of faith and doctrine, self also originates the principles of morality. Marriage, therefore, according to Schleiermacher, is a mere human institution—in fact, the voluntary union of two individuals, which if on trial they find not agreeable, or if one of them finds a more agreeable consort, they may terminate by divorce. The use of a public liturgy is lawful to him who does not believe what it expresses; and, therefore, when the use of the Prussian liturgy, in 1830, was made compulsory, he defends the acceptance of it by himself and the Rationalists, on the grounds that, first, not he who reads, but he who imposes the liturgy is the responsible party; secondly, that they who read it use the words in their own sense; and thirdly, that in the constant repetition of the same words the readers at last attach to them no ideas at all. This is the man whose principles are beginning to make way in England. It is already matter of common report that in some churches his doctrine of the atonement, and his denial of the second Advent, of the general resurrection and final judgment, are preached to the wondering ears of our people. But, of course, that is the affair of the chief shepherds, the bishops. It is necessary, however, for the clergy and laity to know who and what that mighty genius is who is now lauded and praised by those who ought to know better. He is not an Arian; for the Arians acknowledged our Lord's pre-existence. He is not a Socinian; for the true Socinians acknowledged the Divine authority of Scripture. He is not a Deist; for they believe in a personal God and immortality. As the eulogist of Spinoza, the denier of a personal God, the doubter of personal immortality, and the confounder of the ideas of God and Universe, he comes nearest to the Pantheists; and such, as we have seen, is the judgment of two German divines, who must understand his language better than we can pretend to do.

Thirty Years' Musical Recollections.*



R. CHORLEY'S book would undeniably have been a great deal better worth reading if some of its facts had been less open to question, and its writing to criticism. We do not mean to say

* *Thirty Years' Musical Recollections.* By Henry F. Chorley. London: Hurst and Blackett.

that on either of these grounds it is so bad that it is not very well worth sending for to a lending-library. But Mr. Chorley, theoretically at least, will not object to be examined by his own standard of what any work should be, and by such a standard *Thirty Years' Musical Recollections* ought clearly never to have been written at all. This gentleman is in the habit of only thinking indifferently well of some ten out of every dozen of those who appeal to the public either from the stage or the concert-room. The eleventh he tells us is so bad that such an engagement is not from any point of view to be explained; but then the twelfth is all that the others should have been. Mr. Chorley, it is clear, when his critical functions were first ordered was never meant to praise any one; and when he is entirely satisfied, no one else can ever understand the reason. He was on the whole of opinion, when it first appeared that his judgment was to be final, that the ordeal of criticism is not nearly sufficiently severe, and no one needs now to be assured that Mr. Chorley's opinion about compassed the truth. Although Mr. Chorley's treatment of a great many people has been anything but tender, he is seemingly so fond of being strange that he has always been found recommending some one in the *Athenæum* who could never find public encouragement enough for a second season, or dismissing in some three sentences, and with not less than half-a-dozen dashes, an *artiste* whose fame may have been confirmed by Europe. He seems to think that disparagement ought, in proportion to encouragement, never to fall below some three-fourths of the whole; and if he is right about the quantity, we object to the direction of its application. Mr. Chorley is not bound to respect public opinion; but he is, or he should be, bound not to lament that criticism is not more generally applied, and then appear as the apologist of singers who either never understood music or have ceased to be able to sing. It was necessary that Mr. Chorley should be very capricious, and almost a bad writer, to fulfil all the requirements of his post. It was smart, bombastic, and not always English; but if it was tolerated at fourpence and threepence a-week, there was no need further to inflate it, to make of it *Recollections*, and with all its worst faults exaggerated, to offer it again in two vols. post 8vo. for a guinea. No doubt Mr. Chorley has excellent and sufficient reasons for allowing the public to see it all again—all again, too, with all the dashes preserved. But we are not sure, although the book has really amused us a good deal, that the writing is not quite the best part of the entertainment. It is so thoroughly, and yet so unconsciously bad; and then Mr. Chorley placidly enough requires that no one shall dispute what he says. He is not merely satisfied with the admission that he does know much about that of which he writes, although it may be not nearly so much as he says he does. We cannot help feeling that Mr. Chorley's best friend is not his own pen, and that if these *Recollections* had come within the experience of some one better able to express them, an only amusing book would have become a permanently valuable one. Mr. Chorley with emphasis disdains ordinary tests, and he would not like to be judged by a mean standard; but it is wholly impossible to repress the conviction that the arch-critic of the musical world, at whose spasmodic conclusions some *artiste* or another has trembled every Saturday, is not equal to the portraits that he has always offered of himself. When an audience has been seen to rise with enthusiasm before the powers of a great singer, Mr. Chorley has gone out of the *furor* and advised the singer, if he had any respect for himself, never to venture his services again; and he has generally contrived to have it said "that such and such an *artiste* was very successful, but Mr. Chorley is of opinion that the success was not legitimate." However, there may be a sameness in this sort of luxury; so he determined to let us who are now living see what hard things he said of those of another generation. At the same time, putting the badness of the style out of sight, and conceits that have received homage at the hands of troops of singers, Mr. Chorley's *Thirty Years' Recollections* are well worth having; and if a great subject has not received anything like justice, till a better

historian of the period is found they will have to suffice. The readers of the *Athenæum* will not indeed find a great deal that is new; but to others there will probably be inducement enough to carry them through. Indeed, Mr. Chorley's position has given him great and unusual advantages, second only perhaps to those of the critic of the *Times*.

To call on him is generally the business of an *artiste* new to this country; and if no one would think of supposing him purchaseable, no one supposes that he is not to be impressed. There is hardly a great living composer or singer who is not personally known to Mr. Chorley; and their attentions on their arrival, full of the fears of a first trial or a first appearance, are not without a hold on one who devoutly believes that all the musical world depends on the verdict that he has to give. So every page brings us to some familiar name. Mr. Chorley prefaces his volume with portraits of Signor Rubini and Madame Grisi, and the pictures faithfully represent the author's predilections. Indeed, this is just where Mr. Chorley has so contrived to take from the value of his book. With all his wonderful popularity, Signor Rubini was never a legitimate singer, and degraded himself beyond description to sing unlike a man; but there is nothing but praise for the unnatural vocalist; and there is not a word of Madame Grisi's "farewell" impositions, or of Signor Mario's appearances without a note left, whilst he can only say of Signor Tamberlik's unsurpassed voice that it does not entirely satisfy him. Mr. Chorley, who gives something of a biography of nearly every singer of any note, and who does not refuse to give the opinion of Europe when it is favourable to his favourites, in the case of Signor Tamberlik, holds back that testimony which at S. Petersburg and at Paris declares the great tenor to be unsurpassed and almost unapproached. Mr. Chorley, who knows the opinion of both publics, disingenuously enough suppresses them, although at Paris, where Nourrit and Duprez are jealously treasured, Signor Tamberlik is preferred to both by acclamation. We have given only one instance of Mr. Chorley's unfairness, and we might give any number of dozens. But those who are prepared to accept Mr. Chorley's facts will be amused by the way in which he serves them up; and those who may be disposed to criticise may get their share of the entertainment out of the same fund. But when it is said that of every sacred or secular work of nearly every composer or singer of the last thirty years we learn something, the sort of entertainment offered by the book may be estimated. A deliberate judgment is come to about everything or everybody introduced, and in such a way that it will appear safest to leave it undisturbed. It is simply a third-rate book with unusual attractions, of which all come of its subject and none from its style. Whenever Mr. Chorley condemns or commends, is pleasant or severe, he gets about three dashes into every line. The book should be seen on this account alone. We suppose coming from such a quarter that it is quite right; but it does seem to us remarkable that in a work where the style is generally hopelessly bad, the interest certainly never fails. With all its deficiencies it is readable; with all its egotism it may be read without feeling that it had better have been left alone. There is something about everything and about everybody musically interesting during the last thirty years. The publication of these volumes will no doubt bring out others; in which case, if they are only tolerably fair and fairly written, Mr. Chorley's book will be superseded. He will at least have indicated what ought to be done even if he could not do it; but it will never, with any reason, be said that, with all their shortcomings, these *Thirty Years' Recollections* should not have appeared.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In notice of the late Earl Canning, No. II, it should have been—"the highest honours in Classics, and the second highest in Mathematics."

We cannot undertake to return communications.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Church and State Review" is published on the first of each month, price 1s., or free by post for one year for 14s., payable in advance.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.

A Page	£9 0 0
A Column	4 10 0
Per Line	0 0 9

Advertisements must reach the Office not later than the 24th of each Month.

OFFICE: 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Lichfield Theological College.

President—THE LORD BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE.

Council—THE DEAN AND CHAPTER, THE ARCHDEACONS, ETC.

Principal—THE REV. G. H. CURTEIS, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Lichfield Cathedral.

THIS College is open both to Graduates and Non-Graduates. Of the latter a residence of two years is required. Graduates of the University of Cambridge, who have resided one year, and obtained the Principal's Certificate, are admitted by the Bishop of Lichfield as Candidates for Holy Orders, without presenting the Certificates of having passed the Voluntary Theological Examination.

ST. MARGARET'S COLLEGE, NORTH-END, London, S. W. (near the Kensington Station), for the Education of Young Ladies.

Principal—REV. ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A.

Lady-Superintendent—MRS. LENDRUM.

The education and discipline are conducted, under the direction and superintendence of the principal, by talented and accomplished Governesses, English and Foreign, assisted by eminent London Professors.

The buildings consist of a spacious Mansion, with grounds of considerable extent, and large and lofty rooms. Twenty of the senior pupils have separate sleeping apartments.

The next term will commence, after the Midsummer holidays, on Tuesday, the 23rd of September.

N.B.—No day pupils are received.

Prospectuses and particulars sent on application.

ST. PAUL, near PENZANCE.—Our Parish

Church was burned down by the Spaniards in 1579. The roofs of nave and two aisles, the internal walls, and the irregular pews, are all sadly dilapidated; the population is 5,500, chiefly the "Mountsbay fishermen." We have preserved our church-rate to support public worship, and we have just succeeded in rebuilding our Church Town Schools, and opening them for boys and girls under certificated teachers. We have obtained a set of plans for reseating and restoring our Church from Messrs. Salter and Perrow, Architects, 7, Wood Street, Westminster; 315 additional sittings will be secured, and declared free and unappropriated for ever. Will Christian friends help us to procure the required fund of 1,000l.?

CONTRIBUTIONS, either in donations or four or five annual instalments, may be paid to the "St. Paul Church Fund," at the Bank of Messrs. Drummond, Charing Cross, London: and Messrs. T. S. Bolitt & Sons, Penzance.

"It pitieth us to see her in the dust."

JOHN GARRETT, Vicar of St. Paul.

WILLIAM HARVEY, Kerris,

WILLIAM ANGIN, Mousehole, } Church-wardens.

St. Paul, near Penzance, June 28, 1862.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced

TUTORS, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M.A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.

H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

Church-Rates.

THE COMMITTEE of LAYMEN, while they congratulate Churchmen on the renewed rejection of the Abolition Bill, frankly and earnestly call upon all friends of the Constitution to support them with the pecuniary means requisite to ensure similar success for the future. The Committee have hitherto not received a tenth of the annual revenue placed at the disposal of those whose projects they have had to watch and counteract.

It is requested that contributions may be addressed expressly to "The Committee of Laymen," at the banks of Messrs. Hoare, 37, Fleet Street; and Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birchin Lane, London; or to the Honorary Secretary, 16, Manchester Buildings, Westminster, S. W.

JOHN M. KNOTT, Hon. Sec.

June 30, 1862.

Exchanges and Advowsons.

WEST MIDLAND AND WEST OF ENGLAND CLERICAL REGISTER (United).

Conducted by a Clergyman,—a late P. C. in the Diocese.

Offices, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

(Originated April, 1862: 150 Members, Beneficed Clergy and others.)

The above will be found an organized medium by the Clergy in connection with Clerical Business of all kinds, without intervention of agents.

Prospectus on receipt of stamped envelope.

Curates supplied with Curacies, Holy Order Candidates with Titles.

Between 50 and 60 Exchanges offered to Members.

Subscription for the year, 5s. (stamps received).

Address:—The Reverend the Secretary, as above.

PREPARATION FOR HOLY ORDERS : BISHOPS' EXAMINATIONS.

THE Advertiser, a Clergyman (M.A. Oxon.) of experience and great success in preparing gentlemen for the above, residing at Malvern, Worcestershire, (a delightfully-situated place for Reading, with every facility), has Vacancies; (36 gentlemen have read and passed from the Advertiser). His last pupils were a Durham B.A. and a Student of Christ Church, Oxford, for Priesthood; and he has now two reading for the September and Christmas Ordination, M.A.'s of Oxford—Diaconate and Priesthood.

Prospectus of terms and particulars on application.

Letters to contain real names and addresses. Clerical References required. Lodgings easily procured.

High Clerical References and to Pupils in Orders.

The Advertiser procures for his Pupils fit and proper Titles.

Address:—Reverend P. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

SUNDAY DUTY taken by a CLERGYMAN at shortest notice; at half the usual fee, and simple travelling expenses. References.

Address:—Reverend S. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

GOVERNESSES' BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION. Incorporated by Royal Charter, with power to hold land by gift, purchase, or bequest.

Under the Patronage of Her Most Gracious Majesty.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge.

Her Royal Highness the Hereditary Grand Duchess of Mecklenburg-Schwerin.

Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary Adelaide.

President—The Earl of Harrowby.

The objects of this Society are:—

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE to Governesses in distress, afforded privately through the Ladies' Committee.

ANNUITY FUND—Elective Annuities to aged Governesses secured on invested capital, and thus independent of the prosperity of the Institution.

PROVIDENT FUND—Provident Annuities purchased by ladies in any way connected with education, upon Government Security, agreeably to the Act of Parliament. This branch includes a Savings' Bank.

A HOME for Governesses during the intervals between their engagements.

A SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION entirely free of expense.

AN ASYLUM for the Aged.

Auditors—Thomas Hunt, Esq.; Henry Kingscote, Esq.; Capt. the Hon.

Francis Maude, R.N.

Treasurer—Benjamin Bond Cabbell, F.R.S., F.S.A.

Hon. Secretary—Mrs. D. Laing.

Bankers—Sir S. Scott and Co., 1, Cavendish Square, W.

CHARLES W. KLUGH, Secretary.

No. 32, Backville Street, W.

The Scarborough Cliff Hotel Company, Limited.

Capital 120,000*l.*, in 12,000*l.* Shares of 10*l.* each
Deposit 1*l.* per Share on application, and 1*l.* 10*s.* on allotment.
Incorporated under the Joint Stock Limited Liability Act, which expressly limits the liability of each shareholder to the amount of his shares.

DIRECTORS.

Lord Robert Montagu, M.P., Inverness Terrace, Hyde Park, London.
Viscount Ingestre, M.P., Alton Towers, Salop, and 47, Eaton Place, London.
Arthur Pratt Barlow, Esq., Sonning, Berks (Director of the Great Western Royal Hotel Company).
William Cadman, Esq., Wold Newton, Yorkshire, and The Crescent, Scarborough.
Charles Caley, Esq., R.N., Scarborough.
William Cremer, Esq., Brunswick Road, Brighton.
A. H. Darley, Esq., Belvoir Terrace, Scarborough.
J. R. Has, Esq., Merchant, Leeds.
R. H. Page, Esq. (Messrs. Soanes, Son, and Page, Crosby House, Bishopsgate Street, London), Beckenham Park, Kent.
Henry Walker, Esq., The Crescent, Scarborough.

BANKERS.

Messrs. Fuller, Banbury, Nix, and Matheson, 77, Lombard Street, London, E. C.
Messrs. Lloyd, Entwisle, and Co., Manchester.
Messrs. Beckett and Co., Leeds.
York City and County Bank, Scarborough.
Messrs. Thomas Woodcock, Sons, and Eckersley, Wigan.

ARCHITECT.

Cuthbert Brodrick, Esq., F.I.B.A., Leeds, and 14, Buckingham Street, Adelphi, London, W. C.

SOLICITORS.

Messrs. Baxter, Rose, Norton, and Co., Victoria Street, Westminster, S. W.
A. W. D. Leather, Esq., 1, Bond Place, Leeds.

SECRETARY.

Mr. John Wilson Theobald.

OFFICES—6, Victoria Street, Westminster, S. W.

BROKERS.

Messrs. Field, Son, and Wood, 9, Warrford Court, Throgmorton Street, London, E. C.
Messrs. Woolley and Coates, 26, Tokenhouse Yard, London, E. C.
Thomas Knight, Esq., 14, St. Ann's Square, Manchester.
Richard Green, Esq., Park Row, Leeds.

AUDITORS.

John Ball, Esq. (Messrs. Quilter, Ball, Jay, and Co.), Moorgate Street, London, E. C.
Edmund Harvey, Esq., Westminster, S. W.

ABRIDGED PROSPECTUS.

The First Object of this Company is to meet an acknowledged requirement by the erection of a large and beautiful Hotel in a central and commanding position.

The Second Object of this Company is to set apart a suite of attractive rooms on the ground-floor of the Hotel for the purposes of a Club.

The Third Object of the Company is the erection of a row of houses and shops at the foot of the cliff, with a south-east aspect to the sea, in close proximity to the most frequented part of the sands.

The proposed capital will be more than sufficient for the above purposes and for furnishing the Hotel and Club Rooms in the most elegant and attractive manner, and, by working the Hotel on similar principles to those adopted by prosperous existing Joint Stock Hotel Companies, it is estimated that the profits will yield (inclusive of the net returns from the club, library, shops, and houses) from 15 to 20 per cent. upon the capital.

Application for Shares, the deposit thereon having been first paid to one of the Company's bankers, to be addressed to either of the Solicitors; to the Brokers; to Mr. W. B. HINDLE, Park Row, Leeds; or to Mr. EDWARD FAIRBANK, Huntriss Row, Scarborough, of whom may be had, free on application, Lithographs of the proposed Building.

If no Shares are allotted to Applicant, the deposit will be repaid to him without deduction.

Interest at the rate of 5*l.* per cent. per annum will be allowed upon all moneys paid in advance of Calls, and on all fully paid-up Shares, until the Hotel is opened.

Detailed Prospectuses with Forms of Application for Shares may be had of the Brokers, or Solicitors of the Company.

THE SCARBOROUGH CLIFF HOTEL

COMPANY, LIMITED. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that NO FURTHER APPLICATIONS for SHARES in this Company will be RECEIVED from London applicants later than MONDAY, 28th instant, and from country applicants TUESDAY, 29th instant, on which day the lists will be closed.—
By order of the Board,

J. W. THEOBALD, Secretary.

London, 6, Victoria Street, July 19, 1862.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

Vintage Wine Company.

IMPORTERS OF SPANISH WINES.

XERES COMIDA SHERRY,
Soft, Fine Body, Age, and Flavour.

"A marvel of purity and cheapness."—*See Press.*

Golden, 18*s.*; Pale, 20*s.* per dozen.

Samples for 1*s.* 6*d.*

Hampers of Two Dozen carriage paid to any Railway Station.

VINTAGE WINE COMPANY,
14, Bloomsbury Street, London.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices, for Cash only:—

The Complete Suit	52 <i>s.</i>	63 <i>s.</i>	and	85 <i>s.</i>
Morning Coats	25 <i>s.</i>	30 <i>s.</i>	and	45 <i>s.</i>
Trousers	16 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	21 <i>s.</i>	and	26 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>
Waistcoats	10 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	12 <i>s.</i>	and	13 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>
Frock and Overcoats	30 <i>s.</i>	36 <i>s.</i>	and	55 <i>s.</i>

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors,
next door to Somerset House, Strand.

TOURISTS, TRAVELLERS, and others, exposed to the Sun and Dust, will find the application of ROWLANDS' KALYDOR both cooling and refreshing to the face and skin. It allays all heat and irritability of the skin, eradicates eruptions, freckles, tan, and discolorations, and realizes a healthy purity and delicacy of complexion. Price 4*s.* 6*d.* and 8*s.* 6*d.* per bottle.

ROWLANDS' MACASSAR OIL, an invigorator, purifier, and beautifier of the hair beyond all precedent.

ROWLANDS' ODONTO, a Pearl Dentrifice, imparts a pearl-like whiteness to the teeth, strengthens the gums, and gives fragrance to the breath.—Sold by Chemists and Perfumers.

. Ask for "Rowlands'" Articles.

CROSSES, POSTABLE ART-SUNDRIES, &c.

EXHIBITION-PICTURES and other PHOTOGRAPHS, all Sizes, Parcels for selection, post-free, on receipt of 5*s.*, 10*s.*, or 20*s.*

LECTERN or PULPIT BOOK-MARKS, Mediaeval patterns.

Catalogues posted for one stamp.

S. B. BEAL, 8 (late 11), Paternoster Row, E.C.

CHURCH and DECORATIVE EMBROIDERY. FOR EVERY PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH.

Executed from the best and most practicable Designs and Examples of ANCIENT NEEDLEWORK. Ante-pendia, Chancel-carpet, Sermon-cases, Book-markers, &c. &c., prepared with every facility for Ladies own working.

By R. HELBRONNER, 465, Regent Street,
(near the Circus, Oxford Street).

The Conservative Land Society.

INVESTMENTS can be made either in the Share or Deposit departments, with prompt withdrawal when required. The Interest allowed is five per cent. per annum on Share, and four per cent. on Deposits, paid half-yearly. No partnership liability, and the taking of land is quite optional. Depositors do not become shareholders, and the latter only participate in any profits above the guaranteed Interest. The society has paid from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 7 per cent. to Shareholders, and they have received $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the past year. Prospectuses explanatory of the Share, Deposit, and Land Departments, will be sent free of charge and postage to any part of the world. Plots of land for sale in 18 Counties, giving the freehold franchise, and securing a safe investment.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.

33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.

12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE. An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—ROYAL GERMAN SPA, Brighton. Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by GEORGE WAUGH & CO., Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

St. Mary's, Aberdeen.

THE Rev. F. G. LEE earnestly APPEALS for HELP, to complete the Chancel, Mortuary Chapel, Vestry, and Organ-chamber of this Church. It will be the only Church in Scotland in which half the seats will be free. The sanction of the Bishop has been kindly given in the following terms:—

“Aberdeen, with a population of more than 80,000, possesses, for members of our communion, church accommodation for only about 1,800. Considering, therefore, that the present temporary Church of St. Mary is small, inconvenient, and continually overcrowded; and bearing in mind the obvious duty of lengthening our cords and strengthening our stakes, I quite approve of the proposition for building a new Church for that Congregation, and cordially recommend the plan to the charity of the faithful both here and elsewhere.

“THOMAS G. SUTHER, *Bishop of Aberdeen.*

“Dec. 27, 1861.”

Donations may be paid to the “St. Mary's Church Building Fund,” at the British Linen Company's Bank, King Street, Aberdeen.

WINE for the HOLY COMMUNION.

After long and careful search for a PURE SACRAMENTAL WINE, a few casks of very choice and rich “St. Martin,” Malaga, landed in 1839, have been secured as possessing every indispensable quality, and will be disposed of exclusively for this sacred use. Price 50s. per dozen, cash. Best Rota Tent, 42s. per dozen. Orders must be accompanied with a remittance. GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, &c., London, E. C.; and Park Row, Greenwich, S. E.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3/. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free.

Also, ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY. Capital 100,000/. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

Now ready, price 1s. 6d. each, post free,

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC

GALLERY. The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.
BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Moray and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickersteth, Mackenzie, Denison.

DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellcott, Jacobson, Sewell, Guthrie, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolf.

REVERENDS C. Kingsley, Vaughan, Bryan King, Hugh M'Nelle, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upton Richards, W. Gresley, J. Mackonochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. P. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Geyt, J. M. Bellow, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Warehouses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYPEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that RICHARD LOADER and Co. have just published and entirely new and elegant “Illustrated Furnishing Guide,” comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E. C.

84,000/. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at $3\frac{1}{4}$ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, Mr. STEPHENS, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

New Weekly Literary Paper.
The Literary Budget.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF LITERATURE,
 THE DRAMA, SCIENCE,
 AND ART.

Published every Saturday.

PRICE 3d., OR 4d. STAMPED.

The LITERARY BUDGET (under a new management) will, from and after the 5th inst., become a WEEKLY—instead of a MONTHLY—Publication. This change has been considered necessary because it is believed the want of another Literary Journal really exists.

The LITERARY BUDGET will adopt a very plain principle of action. It will lend itself to no clique—be the mouthpiece of no party. Its criticisms of our Literature will be alike fearless and impartial. LITERATURE, the DRAMA, SCIENCE, and ART, will be fully represented.

Finally, the LITERARY BUDGET does not seek to enter into rivalry with any existing Literary Journal, but will adopt a plan and style apart from them all.

The LITERARY BUDGET may be had from Newsvenders in Town and Country, and at all the Railway Book Stalls.

OFFICE: 7, Burleigh Street, Strand; London.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10s.; single sample, 2s.

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

GARDNER'S 2l. 2s. DINNER SERVICES complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3s. 6d. per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7s. 6d. per pair. H. and J. GARDNER (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

KNICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15s. 6d.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,
 150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25s.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,
 150, Regent Street.

Royal Asylum of St. Anne's Society.

Brixton Hill, Surrey, and Aldersgate, London.

PATRONS.

THE QUEEN AND THE ROYAL FAMILY.

ITS Objects—Orphans or not—Children *born in prosperity* whose Parents (Clergymen, Solicitors, Surgeons, Naval or Military Officers, Merchants, or Traders) are *now in adversity*.

In Universality—It has no local bounds—the Children of *any country* are eligible—3,000 have been succoured.

In Advantages—Home, Clothing, Maintenance, and Education to 300.

In Dependence—Voluntary Subscriptions and Donations.

Subscriptions gratefully received by Messrs. SPOONER, 27, Gracechurch Street, or by EDW. FRED. LEEKS, Secretary.
 Office, 2, Walbrook, E.C.

New and Important Works for August.

The ASIAN EXPEDITION. Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers. 8vo. 28s.

NIPHON and PECHELI; Impressions of Japan and the North of China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FON BLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo. Illustrated.

On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. 8vo.

The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS, from 1842 to 1862. By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. 14s.

The CRUISE of the ST. GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

NORTHERN EUROPE. Denmark, Sweden, Norway. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 2 vols. 8vo. 12s.

The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. I. 21s.

The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain, to the last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo. 18s.

New Work by the Author of "Miriam May," and "Crispin Ken."
Now ready, 8vo., 15s.

The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY.

"This work is creating intense excitement in all political circles."—*Morning Post*.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.

66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Imperial Hotel, Great Malvern.

THE Public is respectfully informed that the IMPERIAL HOTEL will be opened for the RECEPTION of VISITORS on Monday, August 11.

The tariff will be so arranged that families and gentlemen may engage suites of apartments or single rooms, at a fixed charge per day, including attendance, and may either take their meals privately or at the table d'hôte, public breakfast, tea, and supper.

Lady or gentlemen boarders will be received at a charge of 2*l.* 10*s.* per week, including attendance.

A wholesale wine and spirit establishment for the sale of wines and beverages of the highest class will be attached to the hotel.

Warm, cold, vapour, douche, running Sitz, and shower baths, will be obtainable at all times in the hotel, a portion of which is set apart for these baths.

A covered way will conduct the visitors direct from the railway platform to the hotel.

GEORGE CURTIS, *Manager.*

Urgent Appeal.

ST. JUDE'S, GRAY'S INN ROAD.

Population 9,000 Souls.

THE SCHOOL CHURCH of this District, in which a large congregation, chiefly poor, now assembles, must be given up to the Metropolitan Railway Company at Lady Day, 1863.

A new Church must be erected, or this CONGREGATION will be dispersed, and the PAROCHIAL MACHINERY in connection with it be broken up.

The site is purchased, and arrangements made to commence building at once, if the further sum of 2,500*l.* can be obtained.

A Friend, in consideration of the urgency of the case, has offered 500*l.* on condition that 500*l.* more be raised to meet it.

Full particulars may be obtained from the Rev. Canon Champneys, 31, Gordon Square, W.C.; Rev. John Andrews, 38, Argyle Square, W.C.; Henry Hoare, Esq., Fleet Street; and John Labouchere, Esq., Birchin Lane. Bankers, Messrs. Stevenson and Salt, 20, Lombard Street.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS at BULL'S LIBRARY.—Surplus Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices.* Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

2*d.* IN THE 1*s.* DISCOUNT ALLOWED on BOOKS and MAGAZINES purchased at 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

PARCELS OF 5*l.* VALUE (at this rate) sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

CLERGYMEN, BOOK SOCIETIES, and LARGE BUYERS, supplied on more advantageous terms.

MAGAZINES supplied regularly on the 1*st* of the Month.

ANY BOOK sent Carriage Free on receipt of the Published Price.

A CATALOGUE of Books for Lending Libraries, sent for one Stamp.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S SERMON and MANUSCRIPT PAPERS, Ruled and Unruled, are sold in packets of 5 quires, at 1*s.* 3*d.*, 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, and 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

SAMPLES sent POST FREE on application.

PAPER RULED to ANY PATTERN on reasonable terms.

PARCELS OF 20*s.* WORTH sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

*This day is published, price 14*s.**

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.

BY SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, BART., M.P.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

*Just ready, small 8vo. with Illustrations, 5*s.**

JERUSALEM THE GOLDEN, AND THE WAY TO IT.

BY THE REV. HERMAN DOUGLAS, M.A.

Author of "Letters on Londoners over the Border."

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE AUTHOR OF
"MARY POWELL."

RICHARD BENTLEY, New Burlington Street.

Authorized Translation.

THE MONKS OF THE WEST, FROM ST. BENEDICT TO ST. BERNARD.

BY THE COUNT DE MONTALEMBERT.

Two Volumes, Octavo, 21*s.*

W. BLACKWOOD AND CO., Edinburgh and London.

*Fcap. 8vo. in Five Parts, 352 pp. price 2*s.* 6*d.*;
in cloth boards, 3*s.**

THE GREAT TRUTHS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

EDITED, AND WITH A PREFACE, BY W. U. R.

I. As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.
—II. What must I do to be saved?—III. It is appointed unto men
once to die, but after that the Judgment.—IV. Work out your own
salvation.—V. The Holy Communion.

"This is a book which we welcome with entire satisfaction: the
truths are expressed with a simplicity of diction which is by no means
common."—*Ecclesiastic.*

"We may call the work a body of Divinity on a small scale for
plain readers, and we have been much impressed with the amount of
Catholic Truth which it contains."—*Clerical Journal.*

London: J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

*Now ready, in 1 vol., extra fcap. 8vo. Third Edition, price 5*s.**

THE LAST DAY of our LORD'S PAS-
SION. By Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D., Author of
"The Life of Dr. Chalmers."

"Dr. Hanna's new work, as a prose-poem on 'The Last Day of our Lord's
Passion,' stands alone in the crowded ranks of our theological literature. It is
a work of fine and reverent genius, and will gain him more fame than even
his well-known and much-admired 'Life of Dr. Chalmers.'"—*Witness.*

"Dr. Hanna has succeeded in producing what is probably the best continuous
narrative of the events of that part of our Saviour's history with which he deals
that exists, at least, in the English language."—*Glasgow Herald.*

Edinburgh: EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS.

London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.,
and all Booksellers.

*Price 2*s.* 6*d.**

Old English Ballads, &c.

FROM PERCY AND EVANS.

WITH NOTES.

"The selection has been made with good taste and judgment."

Christian Remembrancer.

London: BELL AND DALDY.

Now ready, price Sixpence.

A CHARGE, addressed to the Clergy and
Churchwardens at the General Visitation of the Archdea-
conry of Bristol, held by Commission, in July, 1862. By THOMAS
THORP, B.D., Archdeacon of Bristol.

London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place.

Messrs. Blackwood & Sons' Publications.

In Octavo, price 8s. 6d.

Ten Years of Imperialism in France.

IMPRESSIONS OF A "FLANEUR."

CONTENTS.

New Paris.	The Imperial Fertilizing System.
The Cost, and who pays for it.	Moneymania.
Lutetia Parisiorum.	First of October.
Garrison and Camp.	Socialism.
Terrestrial Providence and its Drawbacks.	Death and Resurrection.
Terrestrial Providence and its Advantages.	Body and Mind.
	Gossip.

"It is much the best book, the fairest and the most instructive, that has been published on France, since France became Imperial."—*Saturday Review*.

In Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The Book-Hunter, &c.

BY JOHN HILL BURTON.

"We have not been more amused for a long time: and every reader who takes interest in typography and its consequences will say the same, if he will begin to read; beginning, he will finish, and be sorry when it is over."—*Athenæum*.

In Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Gravenhurst; or, Thoughts on Good and Evil.

BY WILLIAM SMITH,

Author of Thorndale, &c.

In 1 Vol., Post 8vo. 12s.

Captain Clutterbuck's Champagne;

A WEST INDIAN REMINISCENCE.

Originally published in "Blackwood's Magazine."

In Post 8vo. 9s.

The Christian Life, in its Origin, Progress, and Perfection.

BY THE VERY REV. E. B. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

Dean of the Diocese of Edinburgh.

DEDICATED BY PERMISSION TO HER MAJESTY.

Imperial Folio, half-bound in Russia or Morocco, 5l. 15s. 6d.

The

Royal Atlas of Modern Geography.

IN A SERIES OF ENTIRELY ORIGINAL AND AUTHENTIC MAPS.

BY A. KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.S.E., F.R.G.S.,

Author of the "Physical Atlas," &c.

With a complete Index of easy reference to each Map, comprising nearly 150,000 Places contained in this Atlas.

In Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

Poems and Songs.

BY DAVID WINGATE.

In Crown 8vo. 9s.

The Odyssey of Homer.

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH VERSE IN THE SPENSERIAN STANZA.

BY PHILIP STANHOPE WORSLEY, M.A.

Scholar of Corpus Christi College.

Books I. to XII.

In Octavo, 5s.

A Practical Treatise on the Cultivation of the Grape Vine.

BY WILLIAM THOMSON,

Gardener to his Grace the Duke of Buccleuch at Dalkeith Park.

Edinburgh and London: W. BLACKWOOD AND SONS.

Just published, in 2 vols. 8vo., cloth, 1l. 4s.

THE PRINCIPLES of DIVINE SERVICE; or, An Inquiry concerning the True Manner of Understanding and Using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Vicar of Thorverton, Prebendary of Exeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

The concluding Portion, on the Order for the Holy Communion, just published, besides its proper subject, enters incidentally into most of the great religious questions of the day; as Atonement, Sacrifice, the Origin of the Sabbath-day, &c.

For those who have Vol. I. the price of Vol. II. with Introduction will be 1s.; without the Introduction, 8s.

BISHOP OF OXFORD.

Third Edition, crown 8vo., cloth, 6s.

ADDRESSES to the CANDIDATES for ORDINATION on the Questions in the Ordination Service. By SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD, Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, and Lord High Almoner to Her Majesty the Queen.

Now ready, in fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5s.

THE SUFFERINGS of the CLERGY during the GREAT REBELLION. By the Rev. JOHN WALKER, M.A., some time of Exeter College, Oxford, and Rector of St. Mary Major, Exeter. Epitomised by the Author of "The Annals of England."

Just published in 8vo. (480 pp.), with Plates. Cloth extra, gilt top, 21s.

An ATTEMPT to DISCRIMINATE the STYLES of ARCHITECTURE in ENGLAND, from the Conquest to the Reformation: with a Sketch of the Grecian and Roman Orders. By the late THOMAS RICKMAN, F.R.A. Sixth Edition, with considerable Additions, chiefly Historical, by JOHN HENRY PARKER, F.S.A., and numerous Illustrations by O. JEWITT.

Lately published, crown 8vo., limp cloth, 7s. 6d.

A FEW NOTES from PAST LIFE: 1818—1832. Edited, from Correspondence, by the Rev. FRANCIS TRENCH, M.A., Rector of Islip, Oxon.

"Mr. Trench has, we think, judged wisely in giving to the public what he tells us was first printed only for a few friends to read. There is no revelation of anything which delicacy would wish to veil, and he has been able, by publishing these letters, to give public schoolmen and Oxford men a picture of the past which they will glance at with pleasure."

Saturday Review.

Oxford, and 377, Strand, London: J. H. and J. PARKER.

Bicentenary Volume.

THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE have just published a volume which contains all the public documents of importance, from "The Declaration of Breda" to "The Act of Toleration," that relate to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. The documents are collected from the most authentic sources; and being published without note or comment of any kind, they are left to tell their own unbiassed tale. This volume, 516 pp., demy 8vo., printed in a clear handsome type, may be had bound in embossed gilt-lettered cloth, price 4s. 6d., or stitched in paper covers, price 4s.

London: W. KENT AND CO., 23, Paternoster Row; and at the Office of the Committee, 10, Broad Street Buildings, E. C.

Just published, 1s. 6d.; by post, 1s. 7d.

REMARKS on a Recent DEBATE in CONVOCA- TION, in reference to the Scottish Liturgy. By the Rev. HENRY HUMBLE, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Minian's Cathedral, Perth.

London: J. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square.

Aberdeen: BROWN AND CO.

Now ready, Second Edition, 2s. 6d., by post, 2s. 7d.

RESTORATION; or the Completion of the Reformation. By the Rev. ARCHER GURNEY, Chaplain to the English Church, Rue de Madeleine, Paris.

Contents:—I. The Real Presence. II. The Eucharistic Sacrifice. III. Prayers for the Departed.

Price 6s. 6d., by post, 7s.

REDEMPTION; Some of the Aspects of the Works of Christ, considered in a course of Sermons. By the Rev. R. M. BENSON, Cowley, Oxon.

London: J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square; and SIMPKIN.

New Works just Published.

REMINISCENCES of the LIFE and CHARACTER of COUNT CAVOUR. By W. DE LA RIVE. Translated from the French by EDWARD ROMILLY. 1 vol. 8vo.

THOMAS JEFFERSON: an Historical View of Democracy in America. By CORNELIS DE WITT. Translated, with the Author's sanction, by R. S. H. CHURCH. 1 vol. 8vo. 14s.

The Sandwich Islands (Polynesia).

HAWAII: the Past, Present, and Future of its Island-Kingdom. An Historical Account of the Sandwich Islands (Polynesia). By MANLEY HOPKINS, Hawaiian Consul-General, &c. Dedicated by Permission to Earl Russell. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF OXFORD. With a Map on Steel, 2 Portraits in Lithography from Daguerreotypes, and 8 Illustrations on Wood. Post 8vo. 12s. 6d.

HERZEGOVINA; or, Omer Pacha and the Christian Rebels: with a Brief Account of Servia, its Social, Political, and Financial Condition. By Lieut. G. ARBUTHNOT, R.H.A., F.R.G.S. Post 8vo. with Frontispiece and 2 Maps. *[In a few days.]*

IMPRESSIONS of ROME, FLORENCE, and TURIN. By the Author of "Amy Herbert." Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

HISTORY of the ROYAL ACADEMY of ARTS, from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present Time; with Biographical Notices of all the Members. By WILLIAM SANDBY. 2 vols. 8vo., with Several Illustrations engraved on Wood.

Second Edition of Mendelssohn's Letters.

LETTERS from ITALY and SWITZERLAND. By FELIX MENDELSSOHN BARTHOLDY. Translated from the German by Lady WALLACE. Second Edition, revised, Post 8vo. 9s. 6d.

The LIFE of Sir PHILIP SIDNEY. By JULIUS LLOYD, M.A. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Döllinger's History of Christianity.

The GENTILE and the JEW in the COURTS of the TEMPLE of CHRIST: An Introduction to the History of Christianity. From the German of JOHN J. I. DÖLLINGER, Professor of Ecclesiastical History to the University of Munich, by the Rev. N. DARNELL, M.A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. 21s.

ESSAYS on SCIENTIFIC and OTHER SUBJECTS, contributed to the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews. By Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bart., M.D., F.R.S., D.C.L., Oxon., &c., &c., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, and Physician-in-Ordinary to the Queen. 8vo. 14s.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INQUIRIES, Part II.: Being a Series of Essays intended to illustrate some Points in the Physical and Moral History of Man. By Sir BENJAMIN C. BRODIE, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S., Corresponding Member of the Imperial Institute of France, &c., &c. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

The LAW of STORMS: Considered in connection with the ordinary Motions of the Atmosphere. By Professor H. W. DOVE, Berlin. Translated, with the Author's sanction and co-operation, by ROBERT H. SCOTT, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin. 8vo. with Diagrams and Charts of Storms. *[In a few days.]*

LECTURES on the SCIENCE of LANGUAGE, Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, in April, May, and June, 1861. By MAX MULLER, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford; Corresponding Member of the Imperial Institute of France. Third Edition, revised. 8vo. 12s.

The LIFE of Sir M. I. BRUNEL, C.E. Memoirs of the Life of Sir Marc Isambard Brunel, Civil Engineer, V.P., F.R.S., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, &c. By RICHARD BEAMISH, F.R.S. Second Edition, 1 vol. 8vo. with a Portrait and Illustrations, 14s.

A NEW LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY. By the Rev. J. T. WHITE, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Oxford; and the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A., of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford. Imperial 8vo. 42s.

London: LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, AND GREEN.

Church and State Review.

No. 4, Vol. I.

September 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

Political Parties.

ABSTRACT theories are not perhaps very congenial to the changeful and practical course of English politics; but there are times when it is useful to gather up the several parts of our many-sided system into a more or less connected review of the parties, the individuals, and the policies which fill the public eye. The present is particularly such a time, not only because with the close of the Session the immediate work of Parliament is over and its members are scattered far and wide over Swiss glaciers and Scotch moors, but for a far more important reason. English parties are on the verge, if they are not already in the midst, of a great transition of which it is almost as difficult to define or appreciate the nature as it is to predict the issue. Whether our present changes tend ultimately towards fusion or subdivision may be matter of dispute; but some things are clear;—one, that the subsidence of many inferior grounds of party contention has brought out into its legitimate prominence the question of the National Church, of which it is not only safe to predict that, without an entire revolution in our religious and social state, it can never cease to be the primary question of all English policy, but of which it is historically true that it has survived both rebellion and revolution only to vindicate more powerfully its title to pre-eminence among all the highest considerations which are the subject-matter of English statesmanship;—another, that many of the old subordinate watchwords of party warfare, though cherished by the inherent conservatism of Englishmen, have almost passed away with the objects and feelings which called them into active existence. Thus it is that questions which fifty years since stirred men deeply have lost their influence with the present generation. A wreck of disappointment and shattered hopes gathers round questions, domestic and foreign, which had for our fathers so strong an attraction.

Roman Catholic Emancipation, Municipal Franchises, the Test and Corporation Act, nay, the greater and comparatively recent controversies between Protection and Free-trade, all have quitted the world of actual life and have passed into the domain of passionless immaterial phantoms. The fields of political strife are silent. The seditions of

Mr. Pitt's day, the treasonable communications with a foreign enemy, the Cato Street conspiracies, have given way to the milder and more doctrinaire theories of Chartism; and now, in the pitiful decadence of the Ballot and Reform, it is hard to discover the real heirs or trustees of the Chartists of 1848. In the same manner African Slavery has been rescued from something very like indifference by the circumstances of the American war, and has become a theme of actual and not only of traditional interest. The fire of enthusiasm and poetry which lit up the cause of Greek Independence has vanished before the meanness, selfishness, and misgovernment of the Greeks. The romance of South American freedom has been quenched in civil bloodshed and tyranny; and Spain, for whom we so prodigally lavished men and means, grudges us the repayment of a paltry 500,000*l.*

In the drunkenness of midnight we worshipped each creation of our heated fancy, and now in the dawn we can only see around us the broken idols of the cave.

But the past is gone, irretrievably, it may be unsatisfactorily, gone, and now, as with men betwixt sleep and waking, dimly conscious of some coming change, the constant cry is—What of the future? But each watcher in turn as he mounts the wall can only tell of the night in doubtful words. As of old, he hardly knows whether the uncertain forms which he sees are the shadows of the mountains—the mountains of eternal principles, which, whether in light or darkness, will stand for ever; or the outline of marching hosts—hosts of new causes and combinations which may destroy or regenerate society. Along that dark horizon some bright stars have risen; in the renewed energy and strength of the Church of England, and her corresponding hold upon the affections of the people: in the private and public character of the Queen of England, and in the deep and affectionate respect which she has gathered round the Throne: in the ties which—whether they find their strength in sympathy, or in absence of enmity—bind into one, more and more closely, the many classes and interests of this country.

Abroad we have the discreditable spectacle at one moment of democracy suffering and in abeyance; at another of Constitutional conservatism with victory thrust upon it and yet incapable of using the golden opportunities. Lamentably are those opportunities misunderstood, neglected, abused; and Conservative and Democratic principles are

E

rushing downwards together into a hideous chaos of common ruin. France, under the successive traditions of two military empires, has become the terror of Europe, and in the debasement of every social, moral, and literary element is fast becoming the agent of her own retribution; Austria is living, but living on borrowed money; Russia is undermined with ignorant sedition, and overweighted with the burden of precipitate reforms; Italy, with already more than her incapable ministers and her exhausted exchequer, her crafty conspirators and her headstrong patriots, can sustain, grasps at still greater dominion, and rocks with every gale that blows through the cracks of her ill-cemented kingdom; whilst in America the civilized world is threatened with a catastrophe more ghastly than any which it has witnessed since the French Revolution.

However insulated England has been by geographical and political circumstances, the storms of foreign disturbance have never failed to throw some waves upon her shores, and it would be as absurd to deny the influence upon us of passing events as it is unwise to give them the prominence of a morbid exaggeration. We have, indeed, before now stood alone. But we cannot be wholly insensible to the dangers of a position where on every side the framework of society is loosened, and when, out of England, we can nowhere discern the principle upon which to reconstruct the scattered timbers as they drift to and fro on the raging waters.

At such a time we turn with anxiety to those Englishmen who from position, ability, or other cause hold the helm at home. In the first rank are to be seen men who with more or less skill and with more or less success have for many years filled a large space in public attention, but who are rapidly approaching the term when political labour—although the last which men willingly resign—is no longer possible. Nothing, indeed, is more remarkable in the England of the present day than the great age of her Generals, her Judges, her Statesmen, her Prime Ministers: nothing more serious for the future than the wide gulph of unimprovable mediocrity which lies between the oldest and the youngest classes of public men. Of the second rank nothing can be known with accuracy. One thing only we do know, that their accession to political trust and influence will be comparatively sudden, and that whilst more will be required of them less allowance will be made for them than has ever been the case with any of their predecessors.

It is difficult to draw with precision or fairness the lines which separate the various parties in Parliament. There are many subdivisions, some cross-divisions, and frequently a tendency towards the amalgamation or confusion of one section with another. On the Government side, however, of the House of Commons, a rough but threefold classification may be adopted.

1. The Government with their immediate adherents. In the original constitution of this, the most important section, it was intended that the strength of the coalition should be furnished by the Whigs, the ability by the remnants of the Peelites, and the popular credit by the extreme Liberals, who were for the first time taken into partnership. But cir-

cumstances have modified this arrangement. The Ultra-Liberals have gained in Mr. Gladstone an eloquent ally, but they have neither brought to nor received from their new friends any large amount of public credit: the Peelites by casualties and by political absorption have almost disappeared in name as they have in Parliamentary individuality: whilst the Whigs now, as hitherto, enjoy the monopoly of office. True to the State so long as the State can supply them with public place and honour, hostile to the Church even when dispensing her dignities, oligarchs when in, and democrats when out of office, they adhere with singular consistency to the traditions and practice of nearly two centuries.

2. The Liberals. Liberalism has sometimes been defined by its etymology—*id quod liberat*—and few will dispute the justice of the definition when the ties of political principle hang so loosely on modern Liberals. Professing, indeed, an armed neutrality, they generally lend an effective support to that side of the House on which they sit; and, according to the recent confession of one of their ablest leaders, they have sometimes rejected the substance of political improvement from a Conservative Government in order to grasp the shadow of a shade which Whig policy has traced after its own peculiar rules of art.

This class, however, is susceptible of a further subdivision.

First, there are those who, representatives in name, are delegates in fact, and who, under the loose morality of modern politics, think themselves constrained to accept from their electors the hypocritical shibboleth of an unmeaning Liberalism. Shrinking from an abolition of Church-rates, loathing Reform, laughing at the Ballot, they are yet content to record their votes for each measure, and to leave the responsibility and risk of their rejection to others who are less selfish or timid. Secondly, there remain the fragments of the old Radical school, the Anti-Corn-Law League, and the secret partisans of republican institutions. War, foreign policy, the crash of the American democracy, and the suicidal folly of their leader, Mr. Bright, have for the present shivered an ascendancy which some success and considerable rhetorical power had given them. Lastly, there is a small knot of men who claim to be the heirs and depositaries of the philosophical radicalism which some years since found an exponent in the late Sir W. Molesworth. But economists in name, they have produced no effect upon the finance or the legislation of the country, and they are wholly devoid of that vigour and reality of purpose which has sometimes made demagoguism formidable in this country.

3. A small connection yet remains, which, from the weight and ability rather than the number of its members, should be noted. These are the men who, bred up in the lessons of Liberalism, have been gradually conservatised by the incautious preaching of republicanism, the clear tendency of passing events, and their own alarm for the security of property. Denounced by the politicians from whom they have withdrawn, and suspected by those to whom they will not give an unconditional allegiance, they are yet men whose co-operation one day may widen the base of political operations, and whose

support may be as valuable as it would be patriotic.

In turning to the Opposition, the strength of the parties concerned and the difficulties of the position are altogether different. Exiled for many years from office, unsupported by the press, unsustained by political organization, they yet outnumber any other section of the House. In their broad acres and strong common sense the old Country Party finds its best representatives; whilst in a general freedom from selfish objects, and in a recognition of *some* fixed principles by which the relations of the Church, the Crown, the two branches of the Legislature, and the subject are governed, they may lay claim to whatever still remains of the noblest feelings and acts which English history records and consecrates. It is, indeed, sometimes made a reproach against them that in their ranks is to be found a small class of men who, from political capacity and tried service, are justly entitled to a place of prominence and leadership, but whose views on some subjects are in advance of their friends. But this does not necessarily involve any unworthy combination of incongruous elements. Still less is it any blame to them or disadvantage to their party that it should be so. They have only to see that, in the broad and natural sense of the terms, they remain completely within the recognized principles of their party, and that those principles indicate to them fixed points which neither the temptation of office nor the dread of unpopularity can persuade them to overstep.

But no analysis of existing parties, however summary, can be complete without the mention of a third class of politicians equally distinct from the Government as from the Opposition side of the House of Commons. Removed as we are by half a century from the inconsistencies, the difficulties, and the dangers of the old system, Englishmen are sometimes tempted to exaggerate the evils which the union with Ireland has introduced into the relationship of political parties. The general advantage far outweighs the particular inconvenience. Yet the mischief done to "Parliamentary Government," and indirectly to the conscience of the Legislature, is not trifling. On the one hand, the strength of parties is so closely balanced, that a very moderate addition to either scale secures for that side a complete preponderance: on the other hand, an Irish politician feels little of that self-restraint or caution, which is essential to safe legislation, when handling the affairs of a country with which he has little sympathy and no personal interest. Thus it comes to pass that, unattached by permanent ties to either party, he can, by his temporary adhesion, destroy a good Government or maintain a bad one with a facility which is fatal to sound constitutional principle.

Present circumstances, indeed, render this thorny question even more than usually embarrassing to the Conservative party. A systematic course of fast-and-loose policy, of insolence, and even of injustice, have alienated the Roman Catholic population of Ireland from the present Government; and if the Conservatives in this country had, during the last twelve months, invoked the support of Irish members, they would unquestionably have obtained it, and with it a clear majority of the House of

Commons. With a prudence and self-control which we fear would not have been found amongst their opponents, they have not tampered with this seductive but dangerous weapon of attack. Not, indeed, that Irish support in itself is undesirable. Ireland, contented and well-administered under Conservative ministers, might honestly as regards herself, and beneficially as regards the Queen's Government, repay the gift with a gratitude and friendly regard far more valuable than the ordinary advantages which are sought in political combinations. Any other alternative indeed would perpetuate the present immoral and discreditable condition of affairs, and would confer upon the Whigs and Liberals an inalienable monopoly of office. The time may come when Ireland may honourably give, as the Conservative party may honourably receive, a free and spontaneous support: but Ireland ought not to be brought into calculation, and it is on the energy and conduct of English Conservatism alone that reliance can be placed. A connection obscured by the doubt of selfish objects or political intrigue would soon dissolve under the oscillating policy which the exigencies of a minority and a fancied opposition of interests make so strong a temptation to Irishmen; and a suspicion and jealousy would be engendered in England for which no present advantage could compensate the Conservative party, and which time itself could hardly allay.

Such is the outline of parties and political connections in the House of Commons. The individuals who compose or lead them, the measures which it is possible or expedient for any or all of them to carry, the influence which they exercise on the country or which in turn the country exercises on them, are subjects which, however interesting, would carry us beyond our present limits. It is not even possible to follow our analysis of parties into the calmer, but perhaps not less perplexed, region of the House of Lords. Enough, however, has been said to call attention, and to lay the foundation, if necessary, for a future consideration of these questions.

Relief of Distress in the North.



FOR the last twelve months the great "Cotton Interest" has been drifting into distress. As usual, those who were most concerned were slow to believe the reality of the danger, or rather they shut their eyes because they felt their utter helplessness. No man who had studied the character of the Anglo-Americans could doubt that if civil war were once begun it would be carried on with a determination and ferocity to which no European experience could afford a parallel. If in the outset of the contest there were hopes of accommodation, after the battle of Bull's-run all hope ceased. Ever since that day, if not before it, the truth has been seen. The North is fighting for the empire, which has no place in a confederacy; the South for liberty and property and life. No sane man could doubt on which side the ultimate triumph would be. People who fight for an idea—much more people who fight for a

visionary idea—may fight well enough so long as they win battles. But at the first reverse of any magnitude, they begin to suspect that they are doing a very silly thing. Now the discovery does not help to mitigate angry and savage feelings, but rather increases them; and so they go on fighting, grumbling, dissatisfied, defeated; and, in the end, are obliged to succumb to antagonists whose all is at stake, and who must fight and win, or be beat and perish. These are the conditions of this most savage, brutal, and inexcusable civil war. Now for ourselves.

The manufacturers of Lancashire found, almost before they could realize the possibility, that the cotton ports were effectually blockaded, and that even were they opened the planters were resolved rather to give all their crop to the flames than allow it to pass through the hands of the detested Federals. The consequence is, what is called with truth, a Cotton Famine. Scarcity of corn would have been a less evil. Many articles of food may be substituted for grain, but for cotton there is no substitute; especially for that particular sort of cotton which the Southern States afford. No doubt the cotton manufacturers were long ago warned of the danger in thus relying exclusively on American cotton. Far-sighted people saw many causes which might interrupt the production or the regularity of the supply, and actually formed an association for the encouragement of the Indian and other cotton-fields. But they prophesied to those who would not hear; the abundance and excellence of the American cotton checked all misgivings, and the manufacturers were content to go on in a routine which they found so profitable and so convenient. The consequence is this, that, with all that India and other countries can supply, not more than half a million of bales can be reckoned upon to feed the demand not only of this country but of all Europe; for the port of Liverpool is the emporium to which all resort. No wonder then that cotton of all qualities is doubled in price; that, being so precious, it is husbanded by all who have any stock; that others, even if able, should hesitate to buy. For while cotton has thus risen in value the price of manufactured goods has not risen in proportion, so that the manufacturer, after expending his money, skill, and labour, must lose by every pound of yarn and every yard of calico which he produces and brings into the market. Nor at the present rate of the raw material is there any encouragement to store up his produce for better times. Then some of the more selfish have been tempted to make a profit of their cotton by selling instead of working it up. Such avarice is not to be palliated; but when it is considered how the dogmas of Free-trade have fastened upon the Lancashire mind, one cannot be surprised at this practical application of Peel's grand maxim, to sell in the dearest market.

If a manufacturer closes his mill, or even works, as it is called, "short time," it must be under the pressure of necessity.

Suppose him to be wealthy; unless his mill goes on in regular course his capital is unproductive, his machinery pays no interest, expenses in standing wages and the like, rates and taxes come upon him, and all without return. If, like the greater part of

manufacturers, he is trading on borrowed money, then the manifold charges of rent and interest are to be added. It is this class of manufacturers, indeed, who suffer. The more established and independent firms may be reasonably supposed to be in no worse, but rather in a better, pecuniary position from the loss of supply of the raw material. For it is well known that production of the manufactured article was in great excess before that loss came. These firms, then, are in this position. They can sell their stock at advanced prices; they have no interest to pay on borrowed capital; and their outlay in wages of labour is not what it was. Thus they are gaining and saving money all at once.

But after all it is the multitude who are real sufferers,—*plectuntur Achiivi*. It is not merely that they are forced to live on the coarsest fare, having been used to better; that they have exhausted their little savings, and pawned their clothes; but they are actually in want of bread. No shopkeeper will trust them. In truth, the smaller shopkeepers are fast sinking into poverty themselves. But, it is said, there is the Poor-rate; and this under the special provisions of a Statute just enacted, expressly to meet the exigencies of the present case. There is certain relief, and all have a right to claim it.

Doubtless there is relief, but such as the best class of workpeople still feel to be accompanied with degradation. Administer the Poor Law as you will, with all the tenderness and liberality possible, still the tendency of such relief is to bring all down to the level of paupers. The name adheres to them. They are taunted with it afterwards by their fellows. And, though it would be wrong to say that there is not a blessing belonging to legal provision for distress—for a nation's good work cannot be without its reward—yet relief from the Poor-rate can never be the same thing as relief by almsgiving, either to giver or receiver.

But granting Poor Law relief to be stretched to the utmost, till all were swamped in the same slough of beggary, it would not suffice. In the borough of Ashton-under-Lyne, eight weeks ago, one in twenty-two received relief from the guardians of the poor; last week the proportion was one in eight; and still mills are closing, and the necessity increases.

The same tale might be told of every town in the cotton districts. But when the cotton manufacture fails other branches of industry depending upon it suffer also. The colliers have little employment because the huge chimneys have ceased to smoke. And it is to be remembered that some thousands in Lancashire are workers in silk, a branch of trade which for three years past has been miserably depressed. These are industrious people, weaving for the most part still in their own cottages, and producing fabrics which vie with the best Spitalfields' silks. But whether in consequence of the French treaty or no, ever since that date the silk-weavers have been reduced to a condition of pitiable distress.

There is, therefore, ample room for some general effort to help the workpeople of Lancashire.

Perhaps these northerners, whether masters or men,

have not done all they might have done to recommend themselves to their southern countrymen. But what class of people does? Messrs. Cobden and Bright, and the other doctors of the Manchester school, whatever be their merits, certainly have not the gift of conciliation. They do not bear their faculties meekly. Very recently we heard Manchester men boasting that they were quite able to meet their own wants, that they scorned to send the begging-box round, with other phrases equally magnanimous, which those who knew them best interpreted to mean that they would not ask others, because they could not do so without first putting their hands into their own pockets: a process to which some Liberals are disinclined upon principle. But we will not believe, till we cannot help it, that the mill-owners, as a class, are insensible to the special claims upon their bounty which are a part of the facts of this crisis. The northern workpeople, too, it must be confessed, are somewhat rough and forbidding in their manners, and their self-reliance borders upon conceit. But they have great and solid virtues. As a body they are unrivalled for industry, perseverance, intelligence, and independence. They are very sensible of kindness, and their patience under every trial well deserves it. Many who would die of want rather than go before the guardians of the poor accept with the greatest thankfulness such charitable help as the local committees afford. These are organized in most of the towns and villages of the cotton and silk districts, and they distribute weekly what they have been able to collect themselves and what has been transmitted to them from the central bodies, which are three—1. One originated by the Lord Mayor of London. 2. The Bridgewater House Committee, consisting chiefly of the nobility and gentry of Lancashire and Cheshire. 3. The Manchester Central Committee, under the presidency of the mayor of that city.

The Bridgewater House subscription, now exceeding 37,000*l.*, is limited to such as receive no parish relief, and is to be sent to the Manchester Central Committee at the rate of 4,000*l.* per month for six months. The Lord Mayor's fund is dispensed to the local committees, to be distributed at their discretion—only constant returns of the condition of the place are required. Such is the machinery now in action to meet the pressure of the cotton famine. Never, surely, was a greater opportunity for the Church of England to come forward as a body. The necessity is great and increasing. Before the winter sets in there must be millions wholly unemployed. Not food only, but fire and clothing, will be needed for people used to warmth, of delicate constitutions, and living in an uncertain and inclement climate. Why should not the bishops agree (and now and then they do agree) to send forth their pastoral exhortation to every parish in the land, that all may hear, and all may relieve the distress of their brethren. Then such a harvest of charitable gifts would be reaped as this country has never beheld.

There may be reasons why the State should not contribute; but there can be no reason why the Church should not take her proper place as the mother of the poor. The Wesleyans and other

Nonconformist bodies, it is said, are stirring. It would be to their great honour, but to our endless disgrace, if the more perfect union and better arrangements of these bodies enabled them to show us the way in this work of charity.

Lord Canning's Administration of India.



F the century of British rule in India which has elapsed since the battle of Plassy, by far the grandest portion is that which is contained in the last fourteen years. In war or in peace the events of these years transcend alike in interest and in importance any which went before. That short period—all comprised in the two Administrations of Dalhousie and Canning—has been memorable, first of all, for the completion of our Indian empire: for the extension of its limits over the whole Peninsula, from the Himalayas to the sea. Secondly, coincident with the completion of the empire, there has been commenced that extraordinary development of the material resources of the country by the introduction of the wealth, science, and mechanical appliances of the West, which is still going on, and which is plainly destined to effect as great a revolution in the social condition of India, as our arms have accomplished in the matter of political supremacy. And, as it were between those different series of events, there stands forth, and will stand forth to all time, the spectacle of the grand, fascinating, and horrifying conflagration of war which attended the Revolt of the Sepoys: a Revolt which in one sense may be regarded as putting the finishing stroke to our work of conquest, by making an end of the native army by which our conquests had been won,—yet which, in another and truer sense, appears but as the first of a new series of dangers, occasioned by that very increased community of interests, and facilities of intercommunication, among the various sections of the Indian population, which it is our pride as well as our duty to promote.

"All is quiet in Oude" was the telegraphic message from the newly annexed province, which greeted Lord Canning when he first entered the vice-royal palace at Calcutta. All is quiet in Oude and in India now—more quiet and prosperous, we are thankful to say, than ever: yet what a period of storm and commotion has intervened!

It was a time above all others when the powers of the individual shine forth. Everywhere we beheld the fortune of the war turning—not, as in ordinary wars, upon "big battalions," but upon the heroism, firmness, and sagacity of individual men. John Lawrence in the Punjab, Henry Lawrence in Oude, Niel at Allahabad, Havelock at Cawnpore and Lucknow, Vincent Eyre at Arrah, Rose in Central India, and Colin Campbell in the heart of the revolt: the talents and idiosyncrasy of the men stood forth clear and unmistakable in the sphere which belonged to or was appropriated by each. So too with the man holding the reins of power, there is an order of mind which would have made its controlling power felt, and its working seen every-

where. But calm, inert, and invisible, like the impalpable King of the Void, the God of the religion of the Buddhists, Lord Canning throughout all that time of unparalleled crisis reigned, but did not rule. Like a true Englishman, indeed, he never for a moment lost that calm and steadiness in the face of danger which is the characteristic of our race, and which finds its superb type in the bearing of our English nobles. When Lord Elgin, with questionable taste, and more than questionable accuracy, said of his predecessor, "I found him calm and hopeful when every other face in Calcutta was blanched with fear," he conjoined a calumny against the English in Calcutta with a perfectly just tribute to the Viceroy. Lord Canning, like the Roman of old after his defeat, deserved thanks because he never despaired of the State; and if it be fair, as it certainly is, to judge a public man, whose every act and word is so sharply criticised, by ultimate success, his name will be honourably associated with the preservation of our Indian Empire.

And yet on two occasions only is it possible to discover the personal action of Lord Canning during the Revolt. One of these was when he overruled Lord Clyde's plan of the campaign in 1858. At the commencement of that year the veteran Commander-in-chief was ready to invade Rohilcund from Furruckabad,—intending to sweep the rebels out of that province, driving them eastwards before him into Oude; and then once for all, to make a clean sweep of Oude (as he afterwards did), razing its hundreds of mud-forts, and hemming in the rebels between his army and the Himalayas. Lord Canning, on the contrary, resolved that Lucknow must first be taken: a resolution which we shall not question, seeing that political considerations must be allowed at times to overrule strategy; nevertheless, the change (1) delayed Lord Clyde's movements for nearly three months,—because, though he could have swept Rohilcund without the aid of heavy artillery, he had to wait for siege-guns before he could attack Lucknow; (2) the delay rendered it necessary to invade Rohilcund in the hot season; and (3) Lord Clyde, in consequence of this change in his plans, had to make two campaigns in Oude instead of one.

The other instance was the memorable one of the Oude proclamation, which, with the concomitant debates in Parliament, produced so great a sensation in this country in May, 1858. When Lord Canning became Governor of India, he succeeded to the inheritance of a great injustice with its natural consequences. The annexation of Oude, to which, in our judgment, the revolt may be traced as to a primary cause, is not to be justified on any other plea but that of an imperial necessity. If a governing power rest aggression on this plea it cannot reasonably complain that the governed should see no safety from confiscation and ruin but in revolt. Necessity, it is said, has no law. But is there no necessity upon the vanquished to resist, as upon the victor to aggress? Before the Revolt broke out in Oude, it was acknowledged by the Government that, owing to the haste with which the land-settlement had been made after the annexation—in itself a monstrous wrong—great in-

justice had been done in detail to many of the landholders, who were called upon to prove their proprietorship by tests exceptionally stringent, and such as men in their position could not be expected to adduce. Hence the readiness with which the inhabitants of Oude joined in the revolt. But no sooner was Lucknow captured by Lord Clyde, than the Governor-General issued a proclamation decreeing the confiscation of the entire soil of Oude, with the exception of the estates of half-a-dozen Zemindars who had adhered to our rule. It was an edict of confiscation against a whole people. Oude is as large as Ireland and more populous; and what would have been thought of Pitt or Castlereagh if, after the Irish Rebellion, they had proposed to issue so savage and barbarous a decree? The landowners of Oude had been unjustly dealt with at the time of the annexation; but instead of offering reparation for the fault, which was admitted by the Government itself, or making allowance for the irritation which so flagrant a wrong naturally produced among the Zemindars of Oude, Lord Canning added to injustice harshness—happily of so extreme a kind that no one would carry it into effect. Lord Clyde and the military men at once protested against it, declaring that the circulation of such a document would double the numbers and desperation of the enemy. The Home Government on the instant ordered the proclamation to be cancelled, and expressed their censure in very plain terms. Happily, although posted on the walls of Lucknow, the edict did not obtain much publicity; for the military men, who could alone give it circulation, were opposed to it, and by-and-bye Lord Canning himself came round to their opinion. Perhaps it was too much to expect that, when his friends had made a great party fight at home in defence of his proclamation, his lordship should refute those friends by acknowledging his mistake; but it was hardly worthy of his character and his position to cover his retreat in the terms of his reply to Lord Ellenborough's despatch. Lord Canning's real motive for issuing an edict so indefensibly severe—at least the best excuse for it, and the one pleaded by his friends in Parliament—was a desire on his part to terminate the baronial rule of the great landowners, the Talookdars and Zemindars. Everything savouring of feudalism appeared possibly to him, with what looks almost like the shallow bigotry of a "Liberal," a crying evil, which the people of Oude would, like true democrats, be desirous to shake off—the more so as they would then get the lands which they tilled to themselves. The astonishment of Lord Canning, Sir Charles Wood, and his other friends, must have been great when they beheld, as the first consequence of the Revolt, that the Talookdars and Zemindars who had been dispossessed by us in 1856, at once resumed their rights of proprietorship, with the entire support of the peasantry, who openly showed their preference for the old "baronial" regime which Lord Canning imagined must necessarily be detested! And what was the end? At a grand Durbar, held at Lucknow in October, 1859, the Governor-General publicly made amends for his previous error, by formally re-establishing the very system which he had sought to abolish,—proclaim-

ing to the assembled chiefs that "the ancient Talookdaree system of Oude is revived and perpetuated." The crying injustice and the undue severity of the Oude proclamation are the more remarkable in a man who in all other instances throughout the Revolt, and after the Revolt, showed that he possessed, in an eminent degree, in the calmness and the kindness which could not be goaded into cruelty and revenge, two chief qualifications for governing men.

The Revolt was the great event of Lord Canning's Administration, and his conduct during it amply revealed alike the strong and the weak points of his character as a statesman. Self-possessed, amiable, benevolent, honourable, accomplished, willing to learn, and with noble bearing, Lord Canning was in many respects well qualified for his exalted position. But he was wanting in some of the highest qualities of statesmanship. Although governing in a time of extraordinary crisis and commotion, he initiated nothing. Neither in the works of peace, nor in the plans of war, did he leave his mark on the course of events. He was calm and resolute, but he could not originate. He had not the genius by which some men, when transferred to an entirely new sphere of action, comprehend their position almost at a glance. He learned slowly—so slowly that he had only become fully fitted for his position when he left it. In almost every case, during the six years of his rule, his first judgment was wrong. One of his very first acts was, upon the most insufficient reason, to stop the great public works, the construction of which had been the special glory of Lord Dalhousie's administration. Many of these works were canals for irrigation—works of prime necessity for the people, and moreover so profitable as to yield from twenty to fifty per cent.; so that, even if there were no money for the purpose in the Treasury, it would have been well to contract a loan for completing their construction. Again, when the Revolt broke out, it not only found him unprepared, but totally insensible to the magnitude of the peril. Men of prescient intellect, who see at a glance, link after link, the long train of probabilities and possibilities which must flow from a given event, and who make their preparations on a scale proportionate to the exigency, sometimes get little thanks: for the very energy and rapidity of their action, which nips the danger in the bud, also hides from the common throng the natural proportions of the peril from which they have escaped. If Lord Canning be inadequately appreciated, it cannot be from such a cause. Three months before the Revolt commenced at Meerut, the Brigadier commanding at Barrackpore, reported to the Government that they "were standing on a loaded mine." And even after the Revolt had fairly declared itself, the Viceroy persisted in regarding it as a mere local *émeute*. Within twelve miles of Calcutta were stationed (at Barrackpore) three regiments of mutinous Sepoys, and intrigue and plots were rife in Calcutta itself, where there are half-a-million of natives; but when the English in Calcutta offered to enrol themselves as volunteers, Lord Canning refused, and stigmatised their apprehensions as groundless. Within a month, after the

reality of the danger had made itself critically apparent, he was glad to recall his words, and invite his countrymen to enrol themselves to save alike the State and their own homes. Again, in regard to the indigo troubles. For several years Lord Canning supported Sir J. P. Grant, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in taking the side of the ryots against the planters, until large districts were in a state of anarchy. At the last moment, just before leaving Calcutta, Lord Canning became convinced of his mistake, and, suddenly reversing his policy, passed a public censure upon the veteran Lieutenant-Governor. Opposed as we are to the system which Sir J. P. Grant pursued in relation to the planters and the peasantry of Bengal, we regret that the indignity of a public censure should have been passed upon a veteran, zealous, and conscientious servant of the State. For thirty years, we believe, Sir J. P. Grant had never been out of India; and friends and adversaries alike must acknowledge his ability as a practical administrator, and the conscientious spirit which marked all his actions. His father (and, if we mistake not, his grandfather) before him was an able servant of the Indian Government; so that he may be said to have started with a special aptitude for his work. But, besides this, he inquired for himself, thought for himself, acted for himself. It was a hard measure to censure a man like this at the close of his long career.

India saved under his administration, Lord Canning came home to die. It is the last of a name which has risen, and shone, and disappeared among the great names of England within little more than half-a-century. It is much to have to say of the memory of its last inheritor that it is associated not only with the saving of an empire, but with nothing but what is high and honourable; with little of harshness, in a very exceptional and trying time; with all that tells of a noble, and gentle, and cultivated nature,—above all, with a steady refusal in the hour of triumph to take vengeance.

Mr. Disraeli.

IT is now fourteen years since the death of Lord George Bentinck left Mr. Disraeli the undisputed leader of the Conservative party in the House of Commons. Since that period it has steadily progressed in number from less than one hundred and fifty to upwards of three hundred. The gap created in its ranks by the secession of 1846 has been nearly filled up; partly by the gradual reconciliation of individual Peelites, but still more by the continuous elections of new members pledged to the old paths, and loyal to the right leaders. During the same interval the party has been twice in office, notwithstanding it was a minority of the House; and each time, in spite of this disadvantage, has acquitted itself with credit and distinction. Within the same period questions of the deepest importance, and events of the utmost magnitude have engaged the attention of the legislature. And on each and all of them the Conservative party has

won the approval of the public. The statesman who has directed their movements throughout this period, and has ensured, under circumstances of no common difficulty, so favourable a result, must assuredly deserve our admiration. It is easy to say that other men could have done more; but it would be difficult to argue, with even a show of plausibility, that any other man now living could have done so much.

Mr. Disraeli has done a great deal more for the Conservatives than Sir Robert Peel accomplished for the Tories. When the Tory party was broken up in 1832 it still retained its old leaders, its veteran Parliamentary managers, its adroit and eloquent debaters. Outside Parliament it could still count upon its side three-fourths of the aristocracy and clergy, and, in a word, all those lovers of the Constitution who saw that, although much was lost, much yet remained to be defended, and were accustomed to the idea of defending it through the machinery of a political party. Above all Sir Robert Peel enjoyed the incomparable advantage of being associated in the public mind with the courage, the fame, and the inflexible honesty of the Duke of Wellington. His opponents, on the other hand, were new to office. Their allies the Radicals were still worse. The whole party in a very short time dissolved into an unruly mob. Lord Grey retired in disgust. Lord Melbourne and his colleagues, though able and accomplished men, had not the kind of talents required by so critical an era. They did Sir Robert's work for him. The country began to view with dismay our vexatious policy abroad, and the disorder of our revenue at home. Peel waited till the pear was ripe, and then it almost dropped into his mouth.

Almost every one of the favourable conditions which attended the reconstruction of the party during the ten years which followed the Reform Bill were reversed during the ten years which followed the Repeal of the Corn Laws. Irritated as the landowners were by the Repeal of the Corn Laws, that was nevertheless an injury which, as far as they were concerned, stopped there. Some members of the House of Lords no doubt cherished, even as late as 1852, the notion of a revival of protection. They were numerous enough to embarrass Lord Derby, without being numerous enough to bring him back to power on their shoulders. But generally speaking, though relief of agricultural distress was warmly taken up by the landowners, they very soon ceased to make common cause in favour of protection, and that idea being abandoned, the Repeal of the Corn Laws threatened no further consequences, as the Reform Bill had done, against which it behoved them to array themselves. The clergy cared little for the matter. They looked—and so far they were right—more to the preservation of their property, and the support of sound Church principles, than to the actual rent of their estates. And they believed for a long time that these important interests possessed their truest champions outside of the party of Lord Derby. Time has demolished this delusion. But it prevailed very extensively then; and its mischievous effects on Conservatism we are even yet feeling. Thirdly, the warmest admirers of Lord Derby, to

whom the Constitutional party in this country owe a deep debt of gratitude, will hardly assert that he was to Mr. Disraeli what the Duke of Wellington was to Sir Robert Peel. The positions in fact cannot be compared. Lastly, the Conservative opposition, after 1846, instead of retaining its most experienced leaders in its ranks, with one exception lost them all. The party was as destitute of official experience as the Whigs of 1832, and as unpopular in the country as the Whigs of 1783. It had to be entirely reorganized. New leaders and new officers had to be raised out of the ranks. Men had to be found who, by their speeches on special subjects, should establish their fitness to undertake special duties; and who, by making an impression on the House, should acquire the confidence of their followers. The party, in fact, was so much raw material of which an army had to be created.

Now on whose shoulders, almost exclusively, did this labour devolve? Mr. Disraeli's. And in four years time he had a force at his command fit for action. When Lord Derby was summoned to power in 1852 the party was ready. Eleven members of it were sworn in Privy Councillors on the same day. Has not the verdict of the country justified the choice; and are not the men then selected for office still regarded both by the public and their own party not only as the fittest of the whole connection, but as some of the fittest men in the whole country, for the posts which they subsequently filled? Is this a small title to the applause and gratitude of Conservatives? Was this a light task for the leader of a party to accomplish?

Such are Mr. Disraeli's services as the reconstructor of the Conservative party. He made it what it now is. It is hardly necessary to remind our readers of the patience and energy with which he kept his work together during the trying period which intervened between 1853 and 1858. It would not have been necessary at all were not a disposition evinced, in certain quarters, to forget, in the hour of prosperity, those who served them in the hour of adversity. But when, in 1858, his exertions were again rewarded, by being placed, for the second time, in office, his services were universally recognized, and not a murmur was heard against his policy. In 1859, so far from the Reform Bill having been a democratic measure, it was intensely Conservative; and though rightly objected to in some principal points by Mr. Henley and Mr. Walpole, its general effect would have been to give the party that majority in the House of Commons which unforeseen circumstances have since given them without it, but which then seemed impossible of attainment in the existing state of the constituencies.

With the year 1859, Mr. Disraeli's work, as the reorganizer of his own party, may be said to have terminated. The general election of that year, which placed the party out of danger, is the best testimony to his work. As a party-leader he is unsurpassed in the history of Parliament. As the leader of a party in adversity he is perhaps unequalled. His pluck is invincible. He never allowed his followers either to be dispirited by their prospects, or to be dashed by the contemptuous tone, not unfrequently adopted towards them, by

the overbearing arrogance of the majority. He was always ready for the fight. He never shrank from their biggest or boldest bruiser. He gave back scorn for scorn. He never allowed his party to be insulted without punishing the offender. Thus the self-respect of the party was preserved, and they were gradually hardened against both the impudent assumption of their Parliamentary opponents, and the assiduous taunts of an adverse official press. But if we pass from Mr. Disraeli's services as a party manager to the general policy which he, in common with Lord Derby, has counselled his party to pursue, we can appeal, with equal confidence, to the testimony of the last fourteen years. His conduct of those measures which it became necessary to propose to Parliament during the three years which followed the death of Lord George Bentinck was masterly. They all bore reference to the existing agricultural distress, and they were all kept clear from the slightest suspicion of protection. So thoroughly, in fact, did Mr. Disraeli's speeches on these occasions master the opinion of the House, that in 1850 the Government majority was only twenty-one. In 1851 it sunk to fourteen. In the same year the fact of agricultural distress was noticed in the Queen's Speech; and even Mr. Gladstone was found voting with the Opposition. Had not the turn of the tide after the Free-trade depression begun in 1852, it was perfectly well understood that Mr. Disraeli's views must have been accepted, and his proposals more or less carried out.

The dignified and patriotic demeanour exhibited by the Opposition during the Crimean war and the early part of the Indian mutiny was frequently acknowledged by Ministers, accompanied by pointed compliments to Mr. Disraeli, and was reluctantly lauded by even his worst enemies out of doors. This same spirit of forbearance has again characterized his conduct with regard to the American civil war; and it will doubtless occur to all our readers, without being told of it by us, that the behaviour of his party upon this point stands in marked contrast with the instantaneous and unscrupulous attacks upon the Government of Lord Derby in 1859, led on by Lords Palmerston and Russell.

In domestic politics he has acted with equal wisdom, though necessarily with more activity. On the subject of Parliamentary Reform he was the first to bring clearly before the public mind the gross injustice which had been inflicted on the landed interest in 1832, by the proportion in which members had been allotted to the boroughs and the counties. With the detection of this inequality he gave his party a *locus standi* in the question of Reform, distinct from the unpopular attitude of simple resistance. The truth of this grievance was acknowledged by Lord Russell himself in 1854, who, while conceding the honour of the discovery to Mr. Disraeli, made some clumsy efforts himself to redress the wrong which had been exposed. At the same time, Mr. Disraeli, for his part, always said that not even this injustice would have induced him to resuscitate Parliamentary Reform if the "Liberals" would have allowed it to slumber. But they would not. Concurrently, therefore, with Lord Derby, he resolved either to carry a Reform

Bill, or for ever to quash the agitation. If you are really in earnest, he may be supposed to have said to the Whig party, here is a measure of which you cannot disavow the principle, and of which you are at liberty to amend the details. Take it or leave it; but if you leave it, hold your peace henceforward on Reform. They did leave it. They have held their peace. The sham has been found out. And will any Conservative contend that a wiser policy could have been followed? On Church questions the conduct of Mr. Disraeli has been equally wise and far-sighted. We, said he virtually, being a minority in Parliament, can do nothing unless the country supports us. If the Church wishes the Conservative party to undertake her defence, she must not bestow her confidence on the enemies of that party. Mr. Disraeli has always maintained that no great questions could be satisfactorily settled in an English Parliament except by the machinery of party. And he detected at once the uselessness of opposing the Dissenters except as the accredited and authoritative Church party in the House of Commons. As soon, however, as the clergy themselves began to open their eyes to this truth he stepped forward at once, and placed himself at the head of the movement. Our readers may recollect the sensation created by the Aylesbury speech of last November. It was critically well timed, and made a deep impression on the Church. The Liberals affected to laugh at it. But their laughter was turned to lamentation on the twenty-fourth of last June. Mr. Disraeli last autumn told his hearers plainly that the Church victories of the previous Session had been secured only "by a strain upon the vigilance and energy of those who repelled the attack, which cannot be counted on hereafter unless Churchmen and the country party come forward to assist." The advice was taken to heart, and the result adds one more testimony to the sagacity and good generalship of the giver.

It is rather as a financial critic than as a financier that we are invited to consider Mr. Disraeli; and in the pursuit of this art he has certainly displayed the virtue of consistency. He contrasts very favourably with Mr. Gladstone in this respect. We are not among those who deny to statesmen a certain liberty of action, and a reasonably large field for the exercise of a flexible intellect. But changes of opinion which relate to general principles are seldom creditable to any man, unless of very slow growth. A change of mind on the adaptation of means to ends, though it may indicate infirmity of judgment, is no evidence of insincerity. But it is different with ends themselves, and a general principle of taxation may for all practical purposes be considered an end. Mr. Disraeli has lately been a good deal blamed for his strictures upon the Government expenditure for the purpose of additional fortifications. But in those strictures he has adhered rigidly to the maxim enunciated by Mr. Gladstone himself in 1856. "I do trust," said this gentleman, "that whatever may be our differences of opinion we shall not set the pestilent example of abolishing taxes and meeting the expenditure of the country with borrowed money." A few years have passed away, and we see the duties upon wine and paper abolished by Mr. Gladstone himself, and the

"expenditure of the country" provided for by "borrowed money." Now it is the reckless violation of his own admirable canon which has exposed Mr. Gladstone to the censures of Mr. Disraeli. It is disheartening, not to say exasperating, to find this pernicious principle adopted and defended, with the whole weight of his prestige, by the very man who six years ago pointedly and repeatedly denounced it. It is not so much the fortifications that Mr. Disraeli objects to as to the "hand-to-mouth" character of our financial policy. It is very well to say that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has only to provide the ways and means for a single year, and that he is under no obligation to look further, an argument advanced by Sir G. C. Lewis in 1857. This may be true enough where the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not deviate from the beaten track, or make any large experiments upon our fiscal system. But it is *not* true when he does make such experiments. It was *not* defensible in Mr. Gladstone to abolish the wine and paper duties without looking further before him than the end of the financial year. Had he done so, he might perhaps have foreseen, as indeed he was fully forewarned, that our prospects were not so settled as to render all apprehension of additional expenditure ridiculous. In his lofty self-conceit he tossed all these warnings to the winds, and now, when he finds that he himself has been the very man to sanction this "pestilent example" to abolish taxes, and to meet expenditure by loans, he is not, forsooth! to be reproached for it. His behaviour with regard to the Income-tax is exactly analogous. And yet, with all these violations of his own principles, the result of his administration for the last two years is a deficit of seven millions and a-half. Ought any leader of Opposition to allow this state of things to pass unchallenged? Ought he not in season and out of season, whether before or after the estimates have been voted by the Commons, to bring these facts before their eyes? Any petty irregularities of mere form vanish into air before such gigantic mismanagement as this. And Mr. Disraeli is greatly to be praised for having had the courage to press these views upon the House, notwithstanding the passing sarcasms to which he knew he was exposing himself, and the probable unpopularity of his censures with even a portion of his party. Men who are above these considerations are exactly what the country wants. And when people recover their senses, and awake from the narcotic with which Lord Palmerston has besprinkled them, they will understand well enough that for Mr. Disraeli to have held his tongue on these subjects would have been an unpardonable dereliction of duty. In practical financial ability Mr. Disraeli, if facts prove anything, is the superior of the present Chancellor of the Exchequer: for while Mr. Gladstone's calculations have been falsified, Mr. Disraeli's have been generally fulfilled. We have not space enough for the figures requisite to prove this assertion, but need only refer our readers to Mr. Disraeli's budget of 1858, and his "Resolutions" of 1857, for the one fact, and to Mr. Gladstone's speeches in 1853, 1860, and 1861, for the other.

As an orator Mr. Disraeli is, if less vehement

and impassioned, more pungent and more pregnant than his rival. His speeches abound in those felicities which express a great truth only dimly apprehended before, in a shape to be remembered by the multitude. His wit is unquestioned: and his clearness of statement is certainly superior to Mr. Gladstone's. His speech on the introduction of the Reform Bill in 1858, and his reply on the vote of want of confidence soon afterwards, are rare specimens of this power, and may be ranked with the speeches of Mr. Canning, who was remarkable for the same talent.

That Mr. Disraeli should differ from certain members of his party on the propriety of an immediate change of Ministry is discreditable neither to him nor to them. The advantages and disadvantages of such a course are so evenly balanced that nothing but the result could show which were the greater of the two. No doubt, while the Conservatives can make use of Lord Palmerston as a stalking-horse, for knocking over the Radical programme, they gain something; or if he choose openly to adopt their principles, and support their policy, on condition of being allowed to remain Minister, much may be said in favour of continuing the arrangement. The Tories gain numerical strength, which is exactly what they want. But it is at the same time a rather ignoble compromise, to say nothing of the practical hardship it inflicts on the minor members of the party who desire the legitimate and honourable rewards of party fidelity. Mr. Disraeli is famous for loyalty to his followers, and he naturally chafes at this delay. It can be a small matter to him whether he is Chancellor of the Exchequer, or whether he is leader of the Opposition. But it is not a light thing that a great party should have nothing to bestow on its adherents, or that the majority of the House of Commons should be excluded from the administration of affairs.

The Zambesi Mission.

IT is not surprising if the sad intelligence lately received from the missionary party on the heights above the Shiri has somewhat depressed the hopes of the most sanguine friends of the mission, and cast a temporary shade upon its prospects. The circumstances of Bishop Mackenzie's and Mr. Burrup's deaths, though immediately attributable to exceptional and accidental causes which may not ever again recur, betray uncontestedly, if proof were needed, the extreme unhealthiness of the neighbourhood in which the missionary work must be carried on, whatever may be said for the comparative freedom from malaria of the mission-station itself. We read of one after another of the party being laid down with fever; and though quinine and other medical comforts may succeed in reducing the virulence of the disease, yet its enervating effect upon the system must be a constant check to physical and mental energies; while the difficulty of supplies in that inaccessible locality will probably render the want of proper medicines and food a not unfrequent accident. But this consideration is a mere matter of detail; and the worst

contingencies of the kind are not likely to go beyond what has been expected from the first. They are part of the cost which was calculated by those who undertook the mission. They are no worse risks than are commonly encountered by the first pioneers of a colonizing party. Continued residence, one would hope, will gradually acclimatize European constitutions; experience will soon teach the proper precautionary and remedial habits; drainage and clearance of the rank vegetation may drive fevers and agues from the swamps of the Zambesi, as they have done from the fens of Lincolnshire and Essex.

A more serious item of intelligence relates to the conduct of the Mission. The profound sensation excited among the audience in the Sheldonian theatre at Oxford, by the recital of the late Bishop's diary and letters, and the emphatic protest immediately evoked on the part of some of the most earnest friends of the mission, only increased the surprise which a reperusal of the narrative and a calm consideration of the details leave upon the mind that men so wise and gentle could have been drawn into so very palpable an error. How is it that what is evident at first reading or hearing to ordinary Christian judgments should not have so struck the hearts and minds of those good men upon the spot, whose instincts revolted at the measures to which a sense of supposed duty compelled them to have recourse? No doubt a more explicit knowledge of all the circumstances of the case might tend to extenuate our absolute condemnation of those measures. No doubt, as was urged by one of the speakers at Oxford, the utmost confidence ought to be reposed in men invested with such a trust and fully cognizant of all the circumstances, as to the wisdom and justice of their conduct in an extraordinary emergency. No doubt it would be presumptuous to impute blame to individuals for particular acts for which after all they may have been in no degree personally responsible, and which, however highly reprehensible in the abstract, further explanation may show to have been necessary or justifiable. Every possible qualification ought to be conceded with the most perfect sincerity and candour. Yet it still remains the plain duty of every Churchman, especially of every clergyman, and again, most especially of every one in any way sharing the responsibility of the Mission, unequivocally to repudiate that view of the question which the most obvious construction of the late bishop's narrative infers, as to the justifiableness of a Christian missionary taking up arms under whatever provocation, and engaging in military attacks, reprisals, and even bloodshed. The necessity of such repudiation has been enhanced by the late publication of a letter from the Bishop of Labuan, giving an account of an expedition against the pirates of those seas, in which the Bishop appears to have taken an active part. There can be, of course, no question at all as regards simply aggressive warfare; such as that of Cortes or Pizarro. On the other hand, there is no pretence in this instance of a necessity forced upon the missionary-party for the defence of their own lives or property. The warm-hearted Bishop of Capetown emphatically disavows on their behalf any motive so purely interested as self-defence. The plea of justification

put forward is a social obligation of a general kind to protect the weaker and friendly party against the outrages of an invading foe, and in the prosecution of this object, the expediency of inflicting an *ad terrorem* punishment, whether vindictory or preventive in its purpose. Whatever the exact motive may have been, the expedition was deliberately undertaken.

The Committee have acted most wisely in publishing the documents from Africa *in extenso*. A suppression of the details or their publication without a protest would equally have occasioned a strong feeling of distrust, and suggested the impression that the prime intention of the Mission was not the conversion of the native heathen to Gospel truth, but the extinction of the slavetrade *vi et armis*. The wonder is, as has been already mentioned, how any doubt upon the question of duty, much more on that of expediency, could have been entertained in a case so patent. Allusion was made by some of the speakers in the Oxford theatre to the Bishop of New Zealand. He has had to deal with savage races both in the colony and in the Melanesian islands addicted to habits still more inhuman than slave-hunting for purposes of commerce. But his uniform method has been to treat with a most compassionate delicacy even the horrid practices of cannibals, as a constituent part of that dark and cruel heathenism which he trusted to subdue by the gentle persuasions of Christian truth. In a recent letter of the Bishop of Melanesia now lying before us, he vindicates his conduct in this respect:—"The Bishop of New Zealand and I," he writes, "have often sat in a large hut with twenty-seven skulls hanging along the ridge-pole over our heads. I do not wish to speak lightly of such things; but here, too, it is in some sense a conventional notion on the subject which makes man regard this one feature of heathenism as necessarily implying the presence of everything that is bad, and the absence of anything that is good. I see no difference in the moral sense, or the capacity for receiving religious impressions, between the lads and men in our school, who have been, and again (if they fall back) may be cannibals, and those who are not. But we never speak of such things among ourselves. If I say anything it is said privately to the particular person to whom I may think it right to speak on such subjects in his past life." It is, however, superfluous to appeal to precedents of merely human example and authority in proof of the Christian principle; seeing that the one occasion which, if any, would seem to have justified a violent intervention of holy hands in vindication and for the protection of the innocent, has settled once for all the standing rule of casuistry:—"Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they who take the sword shall perish with the sword."

But this portion too of the late intelligence in no way affects the principle of the duty of Churchmen in this country in respect of the Mission. Dr. Livingstone and others most competent to judge have already, with the fullest knowledge of all the circumstances of the case, pronounced a decided opinion favorable to perseverance in the work. The Bishop of Oxford, in one of his masterly ser-

mons preached at the anniversary meeting of the Mission, and since published, has exhausted the question how far the circumstances of the late Bishop's death may be interpreted into a token of God's direction in the matter. It remains for each of us as we best can in our several stations to help forward the work of evangelizing those most benighted of all heathen, where a favorable door has been opened by His Providence for their conversion.

Canada.

WE cannot say that the tone of the debates in the two Houses of Parliament on the subject of the Canadian Militia Bill is exactly what we could have wished. A spirit of resentment at the conduct of the Canadian legislature breathed through many of the speeches on both sides of the House, which we cannot help thinking, with Sir George Cornewall Lewis, was undignified and unworthy of Great Britain. The threatening and dictatorial tone adopted by another class of speakers was no less impolitic and premature. While the purely commercial considerations which Mr. Roebuck and, we are sorry to say, Mr. Adderley also allowed to colour their remarks seem to point to a theory of colonization from which we entirely dissent. Indeed, in this fault Sir G. C. Lewis also virtually participated: for he said he cared very little whether Canada was lost to us or not; which is only to say, in other words, that he weighs the value of her connection with us solely by its material returns in the shape of pounds, shillings, and pence. On the other hand, certainly both Lord Palmerston and Mr. Disraeli used language of a very different import; so that, as they are the leaders of the two chief parties in the House of Commons, our Canadian fellow-subjects may perhaps accept their speeches, and not those of other less prominent individuals, as the true voice of the English people.

The vote of the Canadian Parliament, rejecting the appeal made by the late Ministry for the embodiment of 50,000 militia, suggests, of course, two wholly different trains of reflection. One is in what way the Canadian provinces can be most efficiently defended; the other is upon what conditions the retention of our colonial empire should be held to depend. If we refuse to send troops to Canada to form part of her national defences, unless she is willing to pay for them, we run the risk, be it small or great, of estranging her from British authority; and we have consequently to consider what would be the probable effects, both upon her and upon ourselves, of a final separation between us. Let us take these two questions separately.

The reasons in favour of separation, or perhaps we should more justly say the reasons which ought to make us contemplate such a result with equanimity, appear to be exclusively commercial. Separation would relieve us from a great pecuniary burden, and would entail, as a counterpoise, no pecuniary losses, since Canada has a protective tariff not relaxed even in favour of British goods. The colonists, on the other hand, according to the same

theory, would then for the first time become men. And as it is the mission of England to sow communities of Anglo-Saxon men all over the globe, she must not check the race in its natural progress towards perfection. On the contrary, she should rather encourage it than otherwise, as a mother encourages her children to make their own way, and not to dangle at her apronstrings. That England would gain in money, and the colonists in manhood, is, if we understand it aright, the great argument of the separatists.

It seems to us that the first part of this argument, at all events, is based upon a view of colonization which ought to be the last, instead of the first, adopted by a great empire. The moral grandeur of ruling a vast confederacy, to borrow a phrase from Lord Palmerston, is in our eyes the chief recommendation of our colonial dominion. There is something in the mere fact of controlling the destinies of so many millions of the human race which lends a dignity and nobility to the ruling nation, and acts as an excellent corrective of our mere mercenary propensities. Nor ought we to be insensible to the immense power for good or evil which our imperial position carries with it, or to the vast responsibility apparently attached to us by Providence in the possession of our dependencies. In the second place, it can hardly be doubted that our colonial empire gives us a position in the eyes of Europe which the loss of that empire would destroy. It deeply affects the imagination of foreign peoples, who see in us a kind of combination of Rome and Athens, and are naturally prone to connect the idea of vast resources and immense power with this long chain of dependencies which stretches nearly round the world. England without her colonies would, in the judgment of Europe, be like Samson without his hair. And though Europe might find out her mistake, foreign powers might previously have been tempted into a series of insults and aggressions by no means convenient to ourselves. The whole of these remarks apply more or less to all our colonies, but most closely of all to Canada, as she is the greatest monument of our vigour and our success.

In the second place, how would separation affect the Canadians? It might make them men, if they are not so already. Of this we say nothing. But they would be American men and not Englishmen. In a word, Canada would be Americanized, whether she were annexed or not; and is that a boon we should wish to bestow upon our offspring? The only English colony which has established its independence affords, after all, but a moiety of an argument in favour of throwing off the British yoke. The American State is, or rather was, a very great one. But what is the American individual? Do we wish our Anglo-Saxon plants to grow into such trees as that? Should we be justified in feeling contented with this consummation of Canadian independence? Have we established a province like Canada, enriched it with our money and our blood, and sent out year by year some of the flower of our peasantry to fell her woods and cultivate her virgin plains, in order only that she may become either a miniature America, or merely an American State? This, indeed, would

be not only an inglorious, but an evil future to look forward to. No. It is England's duty not alone to girdle the globe with Anglo-Saxon peoples, but to transplant with them, as far as may be, Anglo-Saxon institutions. In a word, it is not merely Anglo-Saxons, but Englishmen, whom we should strive to reproduce beyond the Atlantic and Pacific. It is the English character we should labour to hand down to future ages, to form the stamina of future empires. And we may be sure of this, that the longer our colonies remain colonies, the longer, that is, that they continue to imbibe constant draughts of English influence, and to look up to England as "the head of the House," so much the better chance is there of the English character being deeply enough cut into their inhabitants to retain the impress through all ages. This is *our* idea of the true end of colonization: and, if it be the right one, then it is almost impossible that the colony *can* remain too long under the wing of the mother country.

These are considerations which have been too frequently lost sight of in the discussion of this subject. But even when they have not been lost sight of, we hear the old argument brought forward that our colonists should be made men of, and that nothing strengthens and exalts the character so much as self-reliance, and discharge of the duty of self-defence. But, as far as self-defence is concerned, we must distinguish between two entirely different things, the helplessness which arises from a sense of dependence upon others, and the simple business-resolution not to pay money for an article as long as one can have it for nothing. No man can say the habit of looking to British troops for the defence of their country has practically made the Canadians unmanly. According to strict theory it ought to have done so: but it has not. Our British ancestors were really rendered helpless by the long tutelage of the Romans. But if every British soldier left Canada to-morrow, Canada would fight none the worse if she considered that fighting was her interest. In this one particular of the Militia Bill she may have shown us a touch of sharp practice. It may be that she would be doing better to take upon herself frankly the defence of her own hearths. It may be that we should have done better to make that stipulation originally. But, having omitted to do so, it would be dangerous to attempt it now. A condition that is submitted to with cheerfulness in the primary framing of a compact will often not be tolerated as a rule to be imposed hereafter. Men will do many things when their consent is asked which they will never do if it is not. We think it very likely, therefore, that Canada *would* resent any effort on the part of this country to impose the duty of self-defence upon her, however reasonable such a duty may be in itself. And so we work round to the old question, is it worth while to give offence to the Canadians for the sake of the money which they cost us? Whether we regard the case as one of English interests or of Canadian, our own answer is in the negative. The longer we keep Canada the better both for us and for the colonists.

With regard to the second point suggested by the late vote, namely, the defence of Canada from

invasion by the United States, it seems pretty generally agreed that the battle could never be fought, except partially, by English troops. At least 100,000 men would be required for such a purpose. But, as far as may be judged from the recent publication of Sir Carmichael Smith, the Canadian frontier is by no means difficult of defence, and a comparatively small number of British troops, if supported by the Canadian militia in possession of the fortified posts, could hold the invaders in check for a considerable period. In fact, a small number of English regulars in combination with militia and volunteers might play the same part in Canada that they are expected to play in England. Some thirty or forty thousand English soldiers, therefore, might form the backbone of the Canadian defence. But then, of course, the Canadians must behave rather differently from their recent Parliamentary decision. If they *will* only undertake to keep up a certain force of militia and volunteers, then it is by no means a mistake on our side to keep even so small a force as 12,000 men in the country. If they won't, then, of course, we cannot expose the flower of our own army to the chance of being captured or destroyed. We do not at all shun the expense of keeping a British army in Canada, if Canada in her turn will only meet us half-way. We do not agree with Mr. Adderley, that Canada should be obliged to pay directly for the services of British troops: but we do think she should be made to understand, courteously and indirectly, that we cannot possibly spare soldiers enough to insure her safety; that untrained levies merely come forward to be shot down; and that if she will not organize some kind of defensive force for herself, not all the resources of England, were England to do her very utmost, could possibly save her from disaster.

India.

T is curious to remark what a much greater hold small questions take upon our minds than large ones. To what extent we are to tolerate or to discourage poaching,—what is the best plan for embanking the river Thames,—and such questions as these, excite far more interest, and are much more keenly debated, than the great problems which we are more or less consciously working out in regard to our colonial and dependent Empires. To what extent, and upon what principles we are to undertake the defence of Canada,—and in what manner we are to govern India,—are questions upon which it is difficult to get men to think. Act we must, and we therefore have recourse to the scrambling policy of acting without thinking.

Here is this great topic of Indian finance, for instance, upon which, if upon anything, our statesmen and those who take an interest in politics ought to have an opinion; yet we huddle it up and get rid of it out of our sight as quickly as we can; or, if we are tempted to spend a few minutes upon it, it is because there happens to be something like a personal quarrel in the case, and there is a laugh

to be had either against Sir C. Wood or Mr. Laing. Perhaps we may even go so far as to inquire what it is that these two gentlemen are so angry with each other about, and may espouse the side of one or of the other upon the great twopenny question, which, like the celebrated Whistonian controversy, has been managed with so much proper spirit on both sides:—"He asserted that I was heterodox, I retorted the charge; he replied, and I rejoined." But few of us, it is to be feared, are sufficiently alive to the real nature of the issue which Sir Charles Wood has raised, or to the mischievous consequences which may ensue from his treatment of the Supreme Council of India in the recent controversy.

We have not space to enlarge upon the importance of governing India upon principles which will ensure the good-will of its inhabitants, will develop its magnificent resources, and will preserve it from financial disaster. Any one who casts even a cursory glance at that great country will see that it is capable of becoming our greatest source of strength, or our greatest element of weakness, according as we manage it well or ill. Neither need we point out the difficulties we have to encounter in consequence of the impossibility of calling in the aid of a local self-administering legislature. Taxation and representation cannot in this case go together. India must be governed by what to her is a foreign despotism. This is a disagreeable truth, but it is one we cannot dispute; the only point for us to consider is, how that despotism may on the whole be made most beneficent and advantageous to the people who have to live under it.

Now, it would seem that if local self-government cannot be had, the next best thing would be local government by authorities practically acquainted with the wants and the feelings of the governed; that is to say, by Governors and Councils residing in India. It would be desirable to select the ablest and best qualified men for these important posts; and, having done so, to leave them free to act according to their judgment and experience upon as many matters as possible; subjecting them to so much control from home as may restrain them from committing India to a course of action opposed to the general interests of the British Empire, but abstaining from petty interference upon matters of detail. And, inasmuch as India is rather an agglomeration of nations than a single nation, and the several Presidencies into which it is divided differ widely from one another, it would seem to be further desirable, while retaining the general control of one Supreme Council upon questions affecting the whole country, to leave to the local Councils in the Presidencies as much freedom as is found compatible with the good working of the whole machine. Such is, in truth, the theory of the constitution under which India is now governed. Let us see, by a glance at her recent financial administration, how far that theory has been carried into practice.

In the days of the Company's government the main sources of the Indian revenue were the land-tax, the monopolies of salt and of opium, and some moderate customs' duties. For many years before the breaking out of the mutiny of 1857 this revenue

had been insufficient to meet the charges upon it. "A chronic deficit," we are told by Mr. Laing, "continued with scarcely an intermission for twenty years, had added 50,000,000*l.* to the debt of India. That deficit had been increased by the effects of the mutiny, until in the three years from 1857 to 1860 it reached the enormous average of 12,000,000*l.*" It was under these circumstances that the Home Government in 1859, finding the local members of Council unable to grapple with the difficulty, sent out Mr. Wilson to give them the aid of his experience and abilities. Mr. Wilson went to Calcutta as a sort of Chancellor of the Indian Exchequer; he was a member of the Supreme Council, and one, as it were, of Lord Canning's Cabinet. He introduced many reforms in the mode of keeping the public accounts, in the system of currency, and in the management of the Treasury balances; he gave an impetus to the reduction of expenditure which had already commenced; and he proposed three new taxes. These were, first, an Income-tax of four per cent.; secondly, a Licence-tax upon trades and professions; and thirdly, an addition to the Customs' duties. The Licence-tax had already before his arrival been proposed in the Supreme Council. Sir Charles Trevelyan, the Governor of Madras, himself no mean authority on matters of finance, had strongly objected to this new tax, as likely to cause great discontent, and had expressed his firm belief that the deficit might be got rid of by the simple reduction of expenditure and by financial reforms. He renewed his protest when Mr. Wilson proposed an Income-tax; but the Supreme Council and the Home Government supported Mr. Wilson and recalled the Governor of Madras. The Act imposing the Income-tax and that increasing the Customs' duties were passed; but Mr. Wilson's own career was here cut short, and he died, a victim to his exertions and anxieties in an unhealthy climate, before he could see the fruit of his labours.

His successor, Mr. Laing, went out at the close of 1860. When he landed in India he tells us that all was gloom and anxiety. The financial crisis was not over; confidence in the Government was shaken; the Europeans, whether civilians or military men, were discontented at the reductions which had been made; and both Europeans and natives were smarting under the Income-tax, the attempts to collect which were giving rise to serious disturbances. Lord Canning himself expressed to Mr. Laing his feeling as to the condition of things by saying, "Danger for danger, he would rather risk governing India with 40,000 troops without new taxes than with 100,000 with them." At the same time Mr. Laing perceived that the labours of Col. Balfour, and of his colleagues on the military commission, were likely to lead to more important reductions in the expenditure than Mr. Wilson had ventured to rely on; and, taking advantage of the experience of the past year, he appears to have urged upon Lord Canning some modifications of Mr. Wilson's plans in the sense of Sir C. Trevelyan's policy. At all events the Licence-tax was at once suspended, and hopes were held out that the Income-tax might in time be dispensed with.

Three years have now elapsed since Mr. Wilson

left England for India to staunch a deficit of 12,000,000*l.* a-year; and three successive budgets have been brought forward in that period. The first, Mr. Wilson's own, was a budget of heavy taxation,—a courageous, and, we believe, a necessary effort to grapple with a mighty evil, but an effort itself involving no slight risk. The second was a hopeful, waiting, budget, in which disappointments had to be confessed and difficulties to be stated, but in which a step was made in the direction of the mitigation rather than the increase of taxes. We have now the third before us; and the change is marvellous. It is no longer a question of a deficit, but of a surplus; no longer a choice of new taxes, but of remissions of taxes. Mr. Laing estimates that the revenue of 1862-3 would, if no change were made, exceed the expenditure by 1,428,000*l.*; and he finds himself in a position to propose at once to remit that portion of the Income-tax which was the most galling and the least productive, and those additional duties upon manufactured goods which fell so heavily upon English industry; and at the same time to devote a larger share of the public revenue to the two great wants of India,—the education of the people, and the improvement of the roads, and other works required for developing the immense natural resources of the country. It would be difficult to find a more remarkable instance of success in the whole history of financial operations; and it would be natural to expect that those who have conducted India through such a crisis to such a result would have received the meed of warm applause from the statesmen of England. But this has not been their lot. Sir Charles Wood, if we may judge from his despatches, is one of those who cannot see great results because he is so engrossed by the small points of detail which have attracted his attention. It appears that there is an arrangement with certain railway companies under which payments are made to the Indian Government in England and by the Indian Government in India on railway account; and that by some oversight the rupee is taken at value of 1*s.* 10*d.* in the one case, while it is really worth 2*s.*, and has to be taken accordingly in the other case; so that the Indian Government at present loses two-pence upon each rupee thus passing through its hands. The loss in the present year amounts to some 458,000*l.* Upon this a controversy arises. Sir C. Wood says this is a loss which should be charged to income; Mr. Laing says it should be charged to capital. This is one point at issue. Another is, whether certain casual receipts, repayments from the Home Government to the Indian treasury, ought or ought not to be reckoned as part of the income of the year. The disputed receipts amount to about 529,000*l.*, against which, however, Mr. Laing sets off a sum of 489,000*l.* for casual disbursements, which he regards as equally exceptional. Into this controversy we do not propose to enter. Sir Charles Wood may be technically right, and Mr. Laing may have somewhat over-estimated his surplus. But when we find Sir C. Wood permitting himself, on the ground of this difference of opinion, to write despatches to the Supreme Council of India, condemning the measures which they have thought it necessary to take for the reduction of

oppressive and injurious taxation, and forbidding the application of the funds they had proposed to devote to the promotion of education, and the extension of public works, in the country of whose necessities they are supposed to be the best and only fitting judges, it is hard to say whether the spectacle be more lamentable or ridiculous. It may be difficult to say how India should be governed; but, if this is a fair sample of Sir C. Wood's usual practice, he is evidently bent upon showing us how far the present system falls short of perfection. The loss of Lord Canning, who would have thrown so much light upon this important problem, is a calamity indeed both to India and to England; but we trust that there will be found men in both Houses of Parliament who will take an early opportunity in the next Session of calling attention to the anomalies of this plan of "double government," and of urging the importance of its speedy reconsideration.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells and Mr. Lingen.



HE bishops are in a difficulty. One evidence, out of many, is the letter of the Bishop of Bath and Wells to Mr. Lingen, with that gentleman's answer.

Now everybody who has observed the relations between the National Church and the Committee of Council for "Education" knew very well that the difficulty was coming; nay, that it had actually come long before the bishops gave public sign of its presence. They knew more; they knew that it was such a difficulty as, in the end, makes a dead-lock, however it may be disguised and put aside for a time. There is always a point at which a loose or latitudinarian policy becomes aggressive upon a Church: aggressive in such sort that the Church is brought to bay, and even bishops have no choice but to turn round and fight. The weakness of the defence is that the fact of this point having been reached steals into the Episcopal mind late in the day; bringing with it unpleasant reminiscences of bad generalship and of something very like cowardice in the earlier part of it.

But, anyhow, the point has been reached now, even by confession of bishops. It was, as a fact, reached long ago when bishops did not confess; and not only said soft and pleasant things of their opponents, but helped them with all their influence. When, some fourteen years ago, the Committee of Council refused to allow a Management Clause E, under which schools with no other managing body than the clergyman of the parish might freely receive aid from the Parliamentary Grant; and when the Committee of the National Society, which includes all the bishops, and is the channel by which their judgment in these matters reaches the public, helped the Committee of Council to establish this most inequitable refusal, the foundation was securely laid upon which every successive course of the aggression building has been added from time to time in natural order.

In a state of things such as this is there are

always certain stages at which the hardship and grievance of conscience originally inflicted upon the Church through the weakness of the defence is developed more prominently and more offensively. Such stages, again, always follow upon some further marked development of that weakness. The stage which we have reached in 1862 is described very plainly in the letter of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, first published in the *Times* of August 7, 1862. It remains to inquire a little into the last development of weakness which has preceded it, and out of which it has naturally sprung.

For it is the primary basis of the *Church and State Review* that the Church can only suffer harm or loss by her own fault: that is to say, either by the fault of those who administer her affairs, or by the fault of Churchmen generally in not keeping the administrators straight when they are going crooked. The blame has commonly to be shared between the two, and the present is a memorable instance of participation.

We are not, therefore, going to assail the Committee of Council. The Committee which we assail is the Committee of the National Society. The people who want telling, and rousing to something like a sense of what is at stake, are the members of the National Society. The Committee of Council are but acting according to their own position and their own lights. They cannot be supposed to have any particular preference for the religion of the Church of England, or for any religion beyond that which any "denomination" may make for itself. It would be to do them great injustice, in the face of their repeated protestations, to suspect them of any such preference. Besides, they are, in one sense, an economical body; and it is their business, without having regard to what the religion of a school may be, so long as there is something in it which is of a religious aspect, to do schools as cheaply as they can. Now it is much cheaper to help one school in a place, having, by a stringent use of the *argumentum ad crumenam*, forced "all denominations" into it, than to help many schools in the same place, respecting scrupulously the form of faith professed in each, and, on this account, dealing with them separately.

This is the position of the Committee of Council, and their *quasi*-religious and economical policy. It discards, of necessity, all idea even of dogmatic religion, creeds, Church authority, and the like. It deals only with every individual man as drawing his religion out of the Bible after the fashion which best pleases himself. We do not say it is a Scriptural position: we do not say it is a good position: we do not say that it is one worthy of an English Government; or consistent with the fact of the existence of a National Church. We only state the case as it is, and leave it for the consideration of Churchmen, and others who do believe that there is such a thing as Necessary Truth.

The question for us is quite another question. Through what intolerable weakness on the part of the Church has it become possible for the Committee of Council to assume this attitude towards the National Church?

The *editio princeps* containing the record—the beginning of the end—was, as we have indicated

above, first published some fourteen years ago. There have been sundry editions since, with appendices to each. But it was not till the year 1860 that the *editio palmaria* saw the light. Then it was that the Committee of the National Society—as it would appear, under the guidance of their Secretary—inverting, by a very remarkable process of adjustment, the system which they had it in charge to keep upright; taking out the very vitals of the Charter and the terms of Union, to see, as we suppose, by way of experiment, whether it be possible for the Charter and the terms of Union to survive under the operation; refusing to admit into Union, as unworthy of that privilege, one kind only of Church school, and that the one kind of Church school which the Charter and terms of Union contemplated—then it was that the Committee of the National Society and their Secretary invited the Committee of Council to perpetrate their last aggression; and by the invitation put the coping-stone to many stories of showy building, the whole of which they are now surprised to find tumbling about their ears.

Hinc illa lacrymæ. Hence the speeches and the letters of bishops. We are glad to see them at last, because it is an indication that they are troubled in their minds: not at ease about the position which they have so largely contributed to establish. But it is not speeches and letters, finding fault with others, that will mend the mischief. The mischief is at home. The mending must begin within. If the Committee of the National Society, with their Secretary, will learn logic, and do justice; if they will not incite the Committee of Council to impose conscience clauses by one document and protest against the imposition by another; if they will not profess to respect conscience by one minute and do it the utmost violence by another, the breach which they have helped the Committee of Council to make in our walls will be repaired. But who supposes that it is possible to contend successfully against a steady and consistent policy, however vicious in itself, by the policy of compromise, of contradictory counsels and failing hearts; or who, whether opponent or friend, has any respect for, or attaches any value to, the feeble and desultory efforts of a divided house; when those who should be one, some of them inflict, and others suffer, a great and crying grievance; when expostulation is met by misrepresentation, and remonstrance by tricks of office? Who imagines that a blessing will attend a policy which does dishonour to the primary function of a Church, that of declaring and delivering The Truth as it has been received?

We will state the case for the information of those who do not know it.

1. A, clergyman or layman, desires to found a school "for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church."

2. A desires to place the school in Union with "the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church."

3. A desires this for two reasons:—first, because his object is identical with that of the Society; secondly, because, while prepared to find nine-tenths of the money wanted, he wishes his school to have its share of the funds of the Society, of the Diocesan Board, and of the Parliamentary Grant.

4. A cannot, in his conscience, found a school of which it is not the rule that every child shall be taught the Catechism of the Church of England. A regards this as the necessary basis of "Education in the Principles of the Established Church." A knows that this is the form of school contemplated by the founders of the National Society, and provided for by the Charter and by the terms of Union. A knows, further, that no subsequent modification of the terms of Union can be alleged as *excluding* this form. A knows, further, that a primary principle of the Church is involved in its admission or exclusion. A, accordingly, proposes to insert in the trust-deed a provision to the above effect.

5. A applies to the office of "the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church;" states his case, and his desire to be in Union.

6. A is told in reply that the constitution of his school, as proposed by him to be ascertained and fixed by the trust-deed, is "incompatible with Union"* with "the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church."

7. A's school is therefore excluded from Union with "the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church,"—being the *only* form of Church school which is so excluded—and loses all grants.

This is the case.

The War in America.

 THREE months ago we offered an opinion respecting the issue of the civil war raging in North America, which, though doubtless shared by many of our countrymen at the time, was not then what it has since become, the universal opinion. And, were it not for the extent to which the passions of men actually engaged in ~~any~~ conflict blind them to everything save the result which they hope to compass, we might marvel that the same conclusion is not by this time accepted in America as unanimously as in Europe. We laboured under this difficulty in forming our judgment, that the facts on which we founded it, (though in truth we relied as much on general principles as on any circumstances or events of the contest,) were furnished to us solely by one party, and that, too, the party on whose wishes and expectations and claims we were pronouncing an adverse judgment. We are still in the same difficulty: our intelligence, such as it is, still comes almost exclusively from the Federals; and yet the impression of the utter impossibility of their triumph is only confirmed by every succeeding mail. Their own newspapers are forced to confess that they have been totally defeated in by far the greatest battle that has taken place since the commencement of the contest: that they have been forced to raise the siege of Vicksburg: and likewise to abandon all hope of entering Richmond, unless indeed, as some

affirm, the extreme unhealthiness of that city should compel the Confederates to evacuate it, in which case we presume that even General McClellan would not be very desirous of occupying it. While the Confederate navy, though hardly consisting of more than a single ship, has reassumed its mastery of the Federal fleet, and threatens to deprive the Federal army also of the greater portion of the advantages which it has gained in Louisiana, the maintenance of which depends on the support which it can receive from its accompanying flotilla. At the same time battle and disease are so thinning the Federal ranks that the President is forced to call for reinforcements on a gigantic scale to which history affords no parallel; and, as the volunteers whom he invites are slow to come in, to announce a project of completing the required numbers by draughts from the militia in a manner which differs but little from conscription. We also learn at the same time that money, at least that which in the old country we understand by money, gold and silver, has totally disappeared; and that, since everything connected with this war is on a gigantic scale, the Federal Government is supplying the place of the precious metals by an absolutely boundless issue of notes, ascending by a half-penny scale; and discernible, like our own postage-stamps, by a diversity of colours, the infinite variety of which, to mark the distinction between notes of a hundred different values, will afford no small scope for the ingenuity of colour-makers. At present we are only told that half-penny notes are blue; three-half-penny notes, pink; those for two-pence-half-penny, chocolate, and so on: but shades of corresponding dignity and magnificence for dollars and pounds will, doubtless, soon be invented: and by means of the tricks to be performed by a commercial and political kaleidoscope such as this the Government at Washington proposes to carry on the war. It is hardly to be wondered at that circumstances such as we have enumerated should be beginning to cause some difference of opinion in the Northern States as to the advisability of continuing the struggle, and also as to the capacity of those to whom the conduct of the struggle is entrusted. And, accordingly, we find in some districts quiet people are beginning to wish for European intervention: while persons less moderate are openly denouncing the war, or the ability of the generals and ministers. The Government so denounced is, however, at least able to cope with its internal enemies: the quiet people are tarred and feathered as a gentle hint to mind their own business: the less moderate are either at once deported to join the army by the warrant of the Secretary of State, or formally prosecuted before the law tribunals. Perhaps it was with a view to discountenance such grumblers more authoritatively and more effectually that President Lincoln himself attended a war meeting lately held at Washington, which passed a series of resolutions, some of which are almost ludicrous in their disinterested ferocity. It was resolved by a large majority that, "rather than witness a dissolution of the Union, we would prosecute the war until our towns and cities should be desolated, and we and all that are dear to us should have perished with our possessions. Let the Union be

E 3

* See Memorandum of July 23, 1860. *Monthly Paper* for September, 1860, p. 257.

preserved, or the country be made a desert." For whose benefit the Union was to be preserved, when all who desired to preserve it had perished, and when the country throughout which it was to be maintained had consequently become a desert, we are not told. Another resolution, since "if at that moment any hesitation appears among the people, it arises only from distrust of the ability of the leaders, whether in the Cabinet or in the field," calls upon the President (the chief of these distrusted leaders) "to assure the people that he is resolved to prosecute the war on a scale limited only by the resources of the country." With regard to the second resolution, the question naturally arises, what idea its framers entertained of the limits of the resources of the country. In some old book, written in reference to some old war, we have seen such a limit described as "the last guinea and the last man;" but the party to which these "resolvers" belong have long got beyond their last guinea, and are very nearly got to their last man, for by their own admission desertion is rife even among the officers; those whom it is sought to enlist are claiming exemption on every possible pretext; and numbers, fearing lest their turn may soon come, are emigrating from the country. And yet they speak as if they were but at the beginning of the struggle. The last resolution is probably that which was intended to have the most practical effect, "The leaders of the rebellion must be treated as irreclaimable traitors, who are to be stripped of their possessions and deprived of their lives or expelled the country." It is not quite clear whether the possessions spoken of, which must be co-extensive with the whole Southern territory, are to be confiscated to the use of the Federal Government, or to be given as rewards to the army which is to expel the present holders. But, however this may ultimately be decided, in its present effect this resolution is evidently a formal sanction to rapine, outrage, and murder; and as such would deserve universal reprobation, if we did not regard it as the frantic meaningless howl of an unscrupulous party beginning to feel its impotency, and unaware that such atrocious threats serve rather to display it to the rest of the world than to conceal it from them.

We might stop here were it not that this war has lately been commented on in England in a speech of Mr. Roebuck delivered in the presence of the Prime Minister. At the Sheffield banquet, held on the very day after the Queen, in proroguing her Parliament, had announced her intention to persevere in the neutrality between the two parties, which this country has so wisely and so honestly maintained, Mr. Roebuck delivered an oration embodying, as he proclaimed, "careful thoughts of many months' consideration," reviling the Northerners, holding up the Southerners as those who alone could be made friends to England; and, as almost an unavoidable conclusion to these premises, urging on the Prime Minister that the time had come for him to take the lead in the recognition of the Southern Confederacy. Our own sentiments on the wisdom of persevering in the maintenance of a perfect neutrality have been already so plainly stated that we need not again insist on or recapitulate them; and it is of more

consequence to our readers to be reminded of the opinion of the Prime Minister. Lord Palmerston only a few days before had wisely denounced all idea of intervening with an offer of mediation. But, if that measure was in his eyes open to insurmountable objections, how much more so must be a step which would not unnaturally, in the eyes of the Northern States, identify us with the new Government thus recognized, as ardent well-wishers, if not as active allies. We would rather perhaps that Lord Palmerston had thought fit on the spot to disclaim all agreement with the speaker. That he did not do so we are persuaded arose rather from a feeling that, while a guest of the great Sheffield Corporation, he was bound to exercise at least the courtesy of silence towards the member whom Sheffield chooses for its mouthpiece, than from any change in his own opinion, or any vacillation in his determination to adhere to that line of conduct which is perhaps more generally approved of by his countrymen than any other passage in his long and eventful political career.

The Use and Abuse of Multitudes.



HOSE who amuse themselves with speculating on the characteristics of the different ages of the world may be disposed to designate the present age as the age of "the many." The greatest happiness of the greatest number is the cardinal maxim of statesmanship in this country, and is asserted to be so even in countries where appearances are all the other way. Everything now-a-days is for "the million;" and "monsters" of all kinds, instead of being objects of terror as of old, have become a popular necessity. Go where we may we meet the vast form of Demos. This is as it should be. Demos has fairly earned his triumph; and he enjoys his honours and prosperity with good sense and moderation. But Demos in a monarchy, moving in a co-ordinate sphere with a monarch and nobles, is quite a different person from Demos in a democracy, moving in a sphere where he has no superior or equal. The one is Demos limited; the other is Demos absolute. Demos limited is an excellent fellow, and a most useful power in the State. Our regret at the state of things that prevails on the other side of the Atlantic forbids our saying what we think of Demos absolute. We may, however, "improve the occasion" by making some reflections on the nature of a multitude. For fear of offending so great a power we shall put our remarks in the form of queries.

Query 1. Whether a multitude can reason deeply on any subject?

If it is contended that they cannot do so, it may perhaps be on some such grounds as the following:—Deep reasoning is a laborious mental process, requiring calmness, reflection, impartiality, accuracy, steadiness, and perseverance. Philosophers have considered solitude to be favourable to abstract studies; and in practical life it is notorious that the capacity of boards is in the inverse ratio to the number of their members. Even in the calm region of Westminster Hall the assemblage of fifteen judges in one court has been found to tend rather to a confusion of tongues than to the erection of any great monument of legal wisdom. Why is this? Are many wise men less wise collectively than they are individually? We fear that, practically speaking, they are; and for the following reasons. Wisdom is retiring and reserved, and the reverse of talkative. It is cautious, and likes to surround itself with "ifs" and "buts," and to disclose itself by slow degrees. It comes out of its shell leisurely and with hesitation. Hence we can never get at the whole of a wise man's

wisdom on any subject in a single interview, even when alone with him, and he ever so well disposed to impart it. Still less can we do so if other wise men are present; for they disconcert each other. Surrounded by a mixed multitude, wisdom, for a variety of reasons, dwarfs itself to the average level of its company, and becomes an ordinary being. Meantime it is not so with folly. If the collective wisdom of the wise is less than that of each wise individual, it were to be wished that the collective folly of the foolish was lessened in like manner. We fear, however, that this is not so, but the reverse. For folly is gregarious, garrulous, and vain. Give a foolish man audience meet, his folly expands itself indefinitely.

This view of the matter seems to suggest the following axiom about multitudes:—That in a multitude, if wise, the collective wisdom is usually less than that of the wisest member; and if foolish, the collective folly is usually greater than that of the most foolish member. Numbers, therefore, seem to have the effect of subtracting from wisdom and adding to folly. A great thinker has stated this matter very forcibly. Locke says:—"God never gave his oracles by the multitude, or Nature truths by the herd;" thus intimating that, in his opinion, reason and revelation alike point out the incapacity of a multitude for any sort of deep reasoning.

Query 2. Whether a multitude can have delicacy of taste?

Delicacy of taste implies a keen sense of beauty, and a subtle perception of the graces in which beauty consists; a fastidious judgment, a certain degree of imagination, and some artistic knowledge. It has been said of the Athenian Demos:—"The laws, which at Athens were referred entirely to the people, who had to decide not more upon their taxes and their ministers than upon refinements in music or innovations at the theatre—to approve the new statue, and consider the ornaments of the projected temple—served to diffuse the popular attention, not over all the vulgar necessities, but all the sublimer arts and elegancies of life: it was necessary to have an eye to grace, an ear to poetry, a nerve to beauty, in order to discharge the daily duties of a citizen. In all things the people were made critics and gentlemen, by being in all things legislators and umpires. Absolute liberty produced universal genius." (*The Student*, II. p. 97, Sir E. L. Bulwer.) Even granting this view to be correct, will manhood suffrage or the ballot make our Demos a creature of the like kind? He is a great wanter and wisher, has large desires and ample means; he is a vast personification of demand. But in the matter of fine art his demands, though extensive, are not of a high order; for he is not a creature of aspirations but of averages.

Query 3. Whether a multitude can act efficiently?

The first thing that a nation does, when a revolution has turned it into a multitude, is to create a dictator; for on a large scale a multitude cannot act at all. But can it act efficiently on any scale, large or small?

Efficient action is the ready adaptation of right means to right ends at the right time. How can a multitude do this in any matter whatever? In our own country does the legislature usually mend matters when it trenches on the province of the executive?

If, then, a multitude cannot think deeply, or act efficiently, or have delicacy of taste, what can it do? What is the peculiar province of Demos?

Query 4. Whether it be not like that of the fly-wheel of a machine, doing nothing specific itself, but keeping up the momentum of every part of the working machinery?

For though Demos cannot think deeply, his impulses are commonly right, and serve to rectify the crookedness of others. Though not the longest headed, he is the largest hearted being in the community, and the least easily perverted by prejudice or routine. Though he cannot act efficiently himself, he is a wonderful stirrer of action in others, and honours and respects the active and able. If he can do but little towards the advance of the fine arts, he may, perhaps, call the attention of others to the total neglect of the fine arts in the places of upper class education in this country.

Query 5. Whether the growing custom of doing everything by multitudes, in the shape of congresses and societies, does not tend to convert thinkers into talkers, and many earnest individuals into a few paid secretaries?

Congresses and societies have their uses: but the former seem more likely to discover defects than to devise remedies; and the latter have, perhaps, had the effect of quenching much noble enthusiasm, substituting the lethargy of general rules for the life of individual action, impairing the sense of personal responsibility, and wasting an immensity of money.

Napoleon I, a master in action, said—"Do everything for the multitude, nothing by it." The principle of our day seems to be—"Do everything by the multitude, and let them fix the standard of all things." What is the result? Is it a general average of ability in all things, and excellence in very few?

The Way of Unity. (II.)

IF one might suppose that Cranmer or Ridley might now be permitted to take a view of the actual state of the Church of England, would they recognize their own work? Would they rejoice in what they had done? or would they wish that they had rather held their hands? It may readily be supposed that in all respects except one they would rejoice in their work; that the marvellous expansion of this Church, no less than the general character of its members and of its services, would be a subject of just thankfulness, while, on the other hand, that one exception would be "our unhappy divisions." If in other respects we have not overtaken the progress of our population; if we are conscious of many shortcomings, of many defects in our existing system, at least it is something that we are conscious of them, and that the remedy is anxiously sought. But in regard to these divisions, of this there can be no doubt that our Reformers would have regarded them as the plague-spot of the Church; as the one counteracting influence by which all their work is marred.

And knowing what we know of the strong opinions of both these illustrious men respecting an appeal to a future free and general Council, it is probable that they would have looked to this remedy, in the first instance, as that which they would desire to see. But before we can fully appreciate the motives which would have led them to such a conclusion, there are some preliminary matters to be considered, which would be more familiar to them than they are, generally speaking, to ourselves.

And these matters are brought the more prominently before us by the sort of dilemma in which we see that our Church is placed in regard to the *trial of doctrine*. It is undeniable, on the one hand, that there is in the Church an unquestionable right to be the judge of doctrine. It is no less undeniable that, in all well-regulated communities, the State has the right and the duty to be the ultimate judge in all matters of law. But we, in this Church of England, have consented that our doctrine shall be accepted and ratified by law. How then do we reconcile the right of the State to be the judge of law with the right of the Church to be the judge of doctrine? The first and most obvious answer is that the State does not judge the doctrine, but that the judge applies the law to the point of doctrine already ruled by the Church. And this is certainly true, and so far it is no more than all religious communities must submit to in any well-ordered State. But what if the case in point have not been ruled, or if the way in which it has been ruled by the Church be not applicable to the case? Is it to be permitted that any new form of unbelief which may arise, however plainly heretical, may not be censured by the Church, if it has not been foreseen and provided against by our existing formularies? The consequence will be that the Church will have no living voice by which to apply a

remedy to emergent evils, but that whatever may have been fixed by law three centuries ago is to remain still the sole stereotyped rule of faith, and that the question is to be not what is true, not what the universal Church of Christ has decreed, or would decree, on any particular point, but whether the matter impugned, however plainly heretical, has been provided for in formularies which were drawn without any special reference to the subject.

It is not denied that here is a great dilemma; and that while willing and anxious to uphold the supremacy of the Crown as the surest guardian of our religious as well as temporal rights and liberties, we feel the difficulty of meeting such a case as this. As it is not our purpose here to suggest alterations in the existing law, we desire rather to point out what we conceive may have been the true theory on which that law was placed. But we must observe that we are referring rather to the principle of the law itself than to those modern and recent modifications of it which have caused so much discussion. Now, it is an essential and recognized principle of ecclesiastical order that the only body which has jurisdiction in the last resort in spiritual matters is a General Council of the Universal Church. We pass by the modern glosses of mediæval Rome, and take our stand with confidence on that well-recognized principle of the Catholic Church. So long as the authority of the Roman Emperor extended, or was deemed to extend, to all parts of Christendom, it was competent to those who might be aggrieved by any judgment of any bishop, or of any smaller synod, to invoke the authority of the Emperor, in order that the question might be settled in a General Council convened by his authority. But when Christendom had come to be divided into so many separate states, and when the Popes had obtained the supremacy over the Latin Churches, and had arrogated to themselves the exclusive prerogative over the faith of the Church, any National Church which should renounce that supremacy was placed in circumstances of difficulty, not so much in consequence of its own act as of the previous assumptions of the Papacy. Such a Church could not pretend to dictate the faith to other Churches. Nor could it affect, as of Divine right, to settle any point of doctrine. It could but declare, as the Church of England in effect declared, certain matters to be those which, according to the best lights it had from Holy Scripture, as received and understood by the Fathers in the primitive ages, it was prepared to hold and teach, subject to appeal to that supreme judge in all spiritual matters, the future free General Council, wherever such might be had. And it is under this appeal that we of the Church of England, after 300 years, still profess to hold and teach for truth that which our Fathers thus received. We do not claim infallibility for our Church; the very idea is excluded by the conditions of our position. We even say that General Councils may err; and justly, because the decrees even of a General Council are not held to be binding until they have been universally received. When they have been so, it is sin to dispute them, seeing that the universal *consensus* is the way in which the promise is fulfilled to the Church, that the Holy Ghost "will guide into all truth."

May we not, then, be content to bear the present inconvenience, as springing not from any fault of ourselves, nor of the State, but from the disjointed condition of universal Christendom itself? If ever it shall please God that a real General Council shall meet again, it will be according to the plainest rules of our actual position that we claim to be heard in it; and, if it be freely conducted, that we submit to its decrees. In the meantime, if it be that the living voice of our own branch of the Church is, in some measure, suspended, we have yet the inestimable blessing of our Prayer-book and our Articles such as our Reformers left them; and though the State in its courts-of-law cannot pretend to settle for us, and repudiates all claim to settle, any new points of doctrine, it does not seem so clear that the application of the principles of evidence to the existing formularies of our Church is in itself an invasion of its spiritual functions.

But, next to a General Council of the Universal

Church, there is no doubt that a Council of the several branches of our own Church, and of the Churches in communion with us, would be advisable to settle any points of doctrine which might come into dispute. We have said, in a former paper, that, while much might be said in favour of such a Council, there are some things that might be said against it. Of this latter kind may be such as the danger of assuming like authority with a General Council itself, and perhaps, also, some difficulty in regard to other Christian communities separated, like ourselves, from Rome; although it must here be confessed that if any of those religious bodies which lost their episcopal succession in the throes of the Reformation might be so inclined to receive it again from us, such a result might be accompanied by manifold blessings. But while there are some dangers, there are also some conceivable advantages. The Convocation of Canterbury has already encountered some difficulties in its endeavours towards Church reform and Church progress, owing to, we will not call it the jealousy, but the sensitiveness of other branches of the National Church. And yet it is above all things to be hoped that, whatever may eventually be done towards a remedy for this difficulty, it will not be by the abolition of our Provincial Councils. A Provincial Council is an essential part of the functions of a metropolitan, and an archbishop has the right to promulgate his canons, not being contrary to the canons of the Church or law of the land, in his Provincial Council, and with the consent of its members. These, therefore, must by all means be preserved. But whether it might be expedient that delegates should be sent from all the other provinces when any grave matter is in hand, such as a canon, or the alteration of the Prayer-book, or possibly some cause of appeal in a point of doctrine—though in this last case we would speak with all reserve—this question is one of a grave and arduous kind.

But it serves to show how large is the field which is opened when such questions are moved. It is acknowledged that the Province of York has a concurrent voice with the Province of Canterbury in all matters of grave moment which affect the Church in England. But then Ireland comes in, and affirms that not by the act of Union only, but, as is now said, by documents six centuries old, she claims to be one National Church with the Churches of the British isles. Be it so; but by the same rule the Colonial Churches, daughter Churches of the Church of Canterbury, may and will prefer their claim. And this circumstance, while it seems to create a difficulty, may be also a providential hindrance in the way of rash changes and intemperate legislation. Then there is the Church in America, and the Church in Scotland, and how wide a field is thus opened to our view when we begin to talk of such a thing as a Pananglican Council.

And yet, if ever it should be seriously attempted to alter the English Prayer-book, or to touch the Articles, it is probable that no less than this would be found to be required. And in regard to other matters, such as a new code of ecclesiastical law, or an appeal on any great cause of faith or doctrine, it might be no less necessary. Much has been said and written about a Court of Final Appeal. Perhaps the truth is that, so long and so far as we are concluded by formularies enacted by law, these questions will have to be settled by courts of law; though much may be said about the actual constitution of the Court of Final Appeal, and many suggestions made for its improvement. But when the final award of such a court shall have been made, it might seem at least to save a principle which is dear to Churchmen, and to indicate a course to which many would look forward as a future prospect of amendment, if it were permitted to either party to lodge an appeal from such a tribunal to the universal episcopate (let us suppose) of the Anglican Communion, in Synod assembled, even though there should be no prospect that such Synod should meet, and though the legal consequences of the decree of the court of law must in the meantime be submitted to. Such a privilege would not be merely visionary. It would indicate the course which such

matters might ultimately take, and it might tend to satisfy men's minds by showing them the existence of a living witness within the Church, whose voice might yet be heard if providential hindrances should be providentially withdrawn.

One thing more. At the time of what was called the "Papal Aggression" there were two things which ought to have been done. First, it was acknowledged afterwards, when too late, that there was at the time a law in existence which might have been available to prevent the publication of the Papal Bull, and to prohibit the new-made Cardinal from setting foot in England. That was the old law of *Præmunire*, which had often been used before for such purposes, and under which a Cardinal charged with a message to Queen Elizabeth had been sent back, in the beginning of her reign. If the Church of England is still subject to this same law, in more respects than one, surely it would have been no injustice to have used it, for once, in behalf of the National Church.

But there was another matter. There were many remonstrances sent up from bishops and clergy on that occasion; but these, with some praiseworthy exceptions, seemed to refer rather to the invasion of the temporal jurisdiction of the Sovereign than to that of the rights and jurisdiction of the Church. That which was required was a formal appeal by the Church of England, in Synod assembled, from the act of the Pope, in pretending to constitute a new Church in England, on his own authority, to the judgment of a future Council of the Universal Church. And if even a Synod should be held of the whole of the Churches of our Communion, it may yet be worthy of consideration whether their proceedings ought not to begin by some such measure. It is not sufficient objection to say that such a course is impractical. Nothing is impractical which tends to place matters on their true ground, and to recall men's minds to the contemplation of those grounds themselves.

Salads.

HE popular notion of a salad seems to be a stale lettuce cut up and deluged with vinegar. Perhaps a little oil or sauce is added, and then, with half-a-dozen radishes to garnish the bowl, the thing is considered very complete. People are not aware of the wholesome and useful auxiliary of the table, which is within reach of the most moderate income, in the shape of salad-herbs. If they were used more freely it is likely enough that we should see less of those diseases which are engendered by excess of animal food.

Salads have high antiquity in their favour. The first account we get of them is in Exod. xii. 8, where the Israelites are enjoined to eat the Paschal Lamb with bitter herbs. Maimonides tells us that there were five sorts of these herbs (the lettuce, which is bitter until it is blanched, ranking first), any one of which might be eaten at the Passover. Descending lower, we find that compositions of raw herbs, with the addition of oil and vinegar, and sometimes of cheese and bread, were used as staple articles of food. The best known of these was the *moretum*, compounded (according to Facciolatus) of garlic, parsley, rue, coriander, onion, cheese, oil, and vinegar. There is a poem, by an unknown author, among the collection added to the works of Virgil, in which the *moretum* is fully described, in thirty-two hexameter lines. The materials are pretty nearly the same as those just mentioned, with the addition of a little salt. It ought, perhaps, to be remarked (even at the risk of frightening modern salad-eaters) that the whole was pounded in a mortar, worked up into a stiff paste, and then swallowed.

This savoury compound reappears in modern times under the name of *gazpacho*, which, in plain English, is the common vegetable soup of the Spaniards. This, it is needless to say, is in summer the staple food of the bulk

of the people—a sufficient testimony of the wholesomeness of salads when properly prepared. In case any careful housewife likes to try this soup, be it known that it is composed of onions, garlic, cucumbers, chilis, all chopped up very small and mixed with crumbs of bread, and then put into a bowl of oil, vinegar, and fresh water. This is used by reapers and other labourers in preference to fermented liquors. Whether it would suit an English climate is another question; but it could scarcely be so maddening as the nasty compound which is often sold to the poor under the name of beer.

It would be tiresome to mention the various passages in classical writers where homage is done to salad herbs, and other fruits of the earth. If Ovid is to be believed, Baucis and Philemon gave the gods little else for dinner, when they came to visit them, and they do not appear to have been dissatisfied. It must have been an agreeable change after the high feeding of Olympus. Horace had some idea of salads, but it was reserved to our own Shakspeare to immortalise them.

"*Laf.* 'Twas a good lady, 'twas a good lady: we may pick a thousand salads, ere we light on such another herb.

Clown. Indeed, sir, she was the sweet marjoram of the salad, or rather the herb of grace.

Laf. They are not salad-herbs, you knave, they are nose-herbs."
All's Well, Act iv. Sc. 5.

"*Cleop.* My salad days,
When I was green in judgment."

Ant. & Cleop. Act i. Sc. 5.

"*Cade.* Wherefore on a brick-wall have I climbed into this garden, to see if I can eat grass, or pick a sallet another while, which is not amiss to cool a man's stomach this hot weather. And I think this word sallet was born to do me good; for many a time, but for a sallet, my brain-pan had been cleft with a brown bill; and many a time when I have been dry, and bravely marching, it hath served me instead of a quart-pot to drink in. And now the word sallet must serve me to feed on."

2 Hen. VI. Act iv. Sc. 10.

If any one desires to see what can be said on the subject of salads, he had better get John Evelyn's curious and learned work called *Acetaria, a Discourse of Sallets*. It may perhaps stimulate curiosity when it is said that he enumerates *seventy-three* varieties of salad-herbs! We should most likely make wry faces at some of his ingredients—nettles, docks, and sundry other *weeds* (as we should call them) figuring prominently. No doubt he thought that what was wanting in flavour in one herb might be compensated by another. *Mais nous avons changé tout cela*. Now-a-days we look for flavour in the herb, and piquancy in the sauce. Without, however, adopting John Evelyn's portentous list, we may make a respectable one of our own. Let us try. Burnet, celery, chervil, chibols (young onions), corn-salad, cresses, dandelion, endive, fennel, lettuce, mint, mustard, nasturtium, parsley, radish, rampion, samphire, sorrel, and tarragon, are indispensable to every salad-eater, and are easy enough to be obtained. A few slices of apple, cucumber, or beet-root (boiled) may be added with great effect.

So much for the materials of the salad. Now for the way in which it is to be prepared. And here let it be said by way of preface—

Non est cuiusvis recte condire.

It is not every one who can make a good salad.

A [very] free translation. Dr. Kitchiner and Mr. Dalgairns, great authorities in their way, not to mention honest John Evelyn, give some very elaborate receipts for dressing salads. In their hands the preparation of this dish becomes a science. The artist also (as he styled himself) who invented a sauce of his own, and used to drive round to his employers in his carriage, charging them half-a-guinea a visit, must not be forgotten. The following, however, is confidently given as a simple and wholesome sauce, after some considerable experience of its excellence. Boil an egg until the yolk is perfectly hard, then put it by to cool; when cold, the yolk may be readily rubbed into a fine powder, then add to it one teaspoonful of salt, one of sugar, and one of flour-of-mustard. Rub these ingredients together till they form a smooth paste, then add gradually two table-spoonsful of good raw cream,

and one tablespoonful of vinegar, thoroughly mixing the whole. This mixture may be flavoured in any way to suit the palate.

Sydney Smith was by no means insensible to the merits of a salad, and his whimsical receipt for making one is far too good to be forgotten :—

“ Two large potatoes passed through kitchen sieve
Unwonted softness to the salad give,
Of mordent mustard add a single spoon,
Distrust the condiment which bites too soon ;
But deem it not, thou man of herbs, a fault
To add a double quantity of salt.
Three times the spoon with oil of Lucca crown,
And once with vinegar, procured from town ;
True flavour needs it, and your poet begs
The pounded yellow of two well-boiled eggs.
Let onion atoms lurk within the bowl,
And, scarce suspected, animate the whole.
And, lastly, on the favoured compound toss
A meagre teaspoon of anchovy sauce.
Then, though green turtle fail, though venison's tough,
And ham and turkey are not boiled enough,
Serenely full, the epicure may say—
Fate cannot harm me—I have dined to-day.”

Smoking.



F all subjects in the world, one would imagine that the habit of smoking might be written about, as it is generally spoken of in good society, without exaggeration and undue warmth. Smokers tell us that tobacco has a soothing effect upon their nerves, and a calming influence on the mind. This is not our experience, but we certainly have seen men very placid under a cloud of tobacco, and may fancy also that it sometimes serves as a corrective for loquacity. It is difficult, therefore, to understand what induces the amount of bile which is always exhibited by a distinguished contemporary when it touches upon smoking, more especially as the writer, or it may be writers, profess that the habit agrees with them. But they cannot tolerate, it seems, that anybody should think, or at least say, that the practice is disagreeable or pernicious. One or two persons who have ventured publicly to express strong opinions against the habit of smoking form the frequent object of these bilious Saturday critics' attacks ; at the same time there is a method in the application of their wit—if it be wit, and not mere “chaff”—for they never exercise it upon Sir Benjamin Brodie, who, perhaps, has had more influence than any other man in making heedless smokers bethink themselves what they gain by indulging in this expensive habit—while they lavish it upon Dean Close with a frequency and in a manner which looks very much as if he had offended them most seriously in some other way than merely by denouncing tobacco. Now, even if a man is a smoker who really enjoys his pipe, we do not see, should he also be a journalist, why he should think it necessary, in discussing the subject of smoking, to tell us that he himself smokes, as if that were any argument, and still less why he should be abusive and impatient with those who are persuaded that smoking is pernicious, and who, therefore, do all they can to persuade their fellow-men not to smoke. We do not even see why an anti-tobacco society should be railed at, as if it were something disreputable, and its members almost reviled, for associating together for what they are persuaded is a laudable object, whether we agree with them or not. We must say, in short, that we certainly do not see what call there is for any party bitterness in discussing the subject of smoking.

It is not the object of this article to endeavour to persuade any one that the habit of smoking is either prejudicial to health or beneficial. We have heard of young men ruining their constitutions by the practice ; we have seen old men who are smokers still enjoying excellent health. We have read Sir Benjamin Brodie's famous letter to the *Times*, in September, 1859 ; we have also read a good deal on the other side. We have, likewise,

been interested by the statistical view copied about a year ago from the French newspapers, from which it appeared, according to the statement, that all the clever young fellows in the Polytechnic School were non-smokers, and all the thick heads lovers of the “weed ;” and we were disappointed Saturday after Saturday at not finding any of our clever writers endeavouring to prove that smoke has an opposite effect in London, perhaps because there smoke may be regarded as indigenous.

As people smoke, we may be sure they like to smoke, though some may be fools enough to do it merely monkey-wise, and can't be said to enjoy it, seeing it only makes them bilious ; while others smoke, not very well knowing whether they really like it or not. Upon the whole there must be an amount of pleasure of one kind or another in the indulgence to account for its existence ; for even the little street blackguards, who make wry faces over their cheroots or “clays,” may be observed at the same time to exhibit an air of independent vanity as they “blow a cloud,” doubtless affording them an enjoyment which is adapted to their not very highly elevated nature. Some persons, it may be true, may smoke as a kind of disagreeable duty, having been persuaded that it is for the benefit of their health, just as fifty years ago in most families immense quantities of pills and draughts were habitually consumed, by a similar persuasion, before the more elegant and agreeable method of physicking by infinitesimals was invented. We are not prepared to argue with those who smoke thus as a duty. Still less with those who like to smoke, and who would, therefore, speaking of the generality, indulge in their liking even were it forbidden in the decalogue. Moreover, we may as well at once freely admit it, that we believe the habit of smoking to be greatly on the increase ; and, indeed, it is because this is so that we write at all.

We wish, in fact, in the most humble manner, only to point out that it may become a hardship to compel people to inhale smoke against their will, and notwithstanding the physical revolt they may therefore experience in their constitution. Indeed, this hardship is not merely theoretical or *in posse* ;—to some extent it really exists. And we believe even the most inveterate smokers will admit, whatever may be their estimate of the pleasures of inhaling the smoke of tobacco, if I may so say, *fresh* from the weed, that second-hand and stale smoke is abominable. Now, if tobacco makes men calm and contented in themselves, well ; but surely they need not, therefore, become selfish. And yet the great majority of smokers appear to think that they are entitled to smoke almost anywhere, without reference to the likes or dislikes of their neighbours. Some, it must be acknowledged, seldom smoke when near other people without first asking whether it is objectionable or not ; but even those do not seem to be aware that, in smoking in the street, they make themselves, more or less, a nuisance to a considerable percentage of those who pass them, and who have a prior right to enjoy the air of heaven in as pure a state as may be possible among the dwellings of men. A few years ago, that is to say, twenty years ago, it was not the practice of gentlemen, and hardly of any one, to smoke in the streets, at least, during the day, and when the thoroughfares are crowded. Now, however, it is. Is this change for the better ? We venture to think not. It cannot be good manners, and therefore not really gentlemanly, to do what is disagreeable to others for our own indulgence. We presume it is on this ground that smoking in the streets is prohibited in Vienna, and some other towns. A clap-trap phrase about Austrian tyranny will not be an argument against such a prohibition. For ourselves, we should infinitely prefer to see—as before was the case in this country—that the voluntary good manners of English gentlemen should settle all such points. But if not ; and if the prevalence of smoking should extend from the streets (and even from carriages in which gentlemen seated along with ladies may now be seen smoking) to within doors, we beg to ask, is there to be no remedy or relief for those who dislike the smell of tobacco, or those

whom it makes positively ill? On the tops of coaches and omnibuses "the nuisance" is already not a slight one. The form of asking permission is rarely gone through, and is not expected to be regarded as more than a form. The difficulties experienced by railway companies in preventing smoking in the carriages indiscriminately are notorious. Most people also know perfectly well that their smoking friends rather affect, as a rule, an utter disregard of railway prohibitions; and are in the habit of boasting how they tipped the guard, or deceived him, and smoked "in spite of the directors." Most people, too, who dislike the stink of tobacco have frequently in their lives been weak or compliant enough to say they had no objection (sometimes at the expense of a headache shortly afterwards) to another smoking beside them, when the question has been civilly put outside a coach, or even in a railway carriage. Now, we ask, is it not time to make a stand as to this? Why should I, who may live out of town for the value of fresh air, be unable to get to town, by a public conveyance, without having the pure air which I wish to inhale contaminated, as I think, by tobacco smoke, or be driven inside, where again fresh air may be shut out, as of right, by some fellow traveller? We purposely leave out of consideration some minor disagreeables,—as, for instance, an occasional whiff of the disagreeable breath of a regular smoker in conversation. Were it not that the ladies' journals are probably chiefly written by spinsters, we imagine we ought to have something emphatic as to the various domestic annoyances arising from tobacco smoke; and we might hope that female influence would have been useful, through the press, in checking the indulgence of smoking. Although little or nothing has been here said as to its effect upon the health, one cannot but remark that the practice is merely one of the most unnatural and artificial inventions of mankind. Greek and Roman intellectual and physical strength was certainly attained without it; and had it been then invented, Plato would doubtless have banished it from his republic. One can as little almost imagine a smoking Socrates or Pliny as a smoking or snuffy apostle, whatever may be now the habits of some amongst our clergy. And whatever the Saturday reviewers may think or write to the contrary, we venture to believe that if the "perfect man" were now portrayed by an Aristotle he would not be characterized as a smoker. We hear a good deal, no doubt, of moderation in smoking, as being like moderation in other things. We venture to doubt this on ethical principles. What is itself superfluous and unnecessary cannot come under the category of "the temperate" in any shape. But we are here pleading on lower ground, merely that it is not fair that one person should be compelled, against his will, to swallow another man's smoke.

Brotherhoods.

BROTHERHOODS! Church of England Brotherhoods! Can members of Christ's Church in England be in any way incorporated in communities to perform the Levitical functions of the Church? This, we believe, is one of the great questions of the day, which every year will assume a more prominent importance, as the Church of England rouses herself to her work, with a clearer view of its enormous extent, and a deeper experience of the hopelessness of accomplishing it by the hands of individuals. Some progress has already been made. It is no longer necessary to drop the idea in hints, in fiction, with apologies for dreaming of impossibilities, and protests against charges of monasticism and of Romanizing. The parochial clergyman in our large towns does entertain the idea that to gather round him a body of curates under one roof might materially strengthen his position, economize his resources, and facilitate all their labours. The missionary bishop, as his first object, tries to rally round him, if possible, a little

band of devoted men to stand by him in his labours. More or less the idea is leavening our dreams of education. Whether it can be realized, or in what precise form the attempt should be made, is still a problem unsolved. But it is something that the English mind, always in the long-run converging to a sober, practical examination of expediency and truth, will consent to face the question, instead of starting away from it at the first glance with repugnance, suspicion, and alarm. We are speaking now of brotherhoods, not of sisterhoods. This latter idea, as indeed was natural, has made far greater progress than the former in public estimation, and should always be discussed separately. Sisterhoods are far easier to form and to perpetuate than brotherhoods. The materials are more abundant, the organization more simple and natural, their essentially subordinate position disarms suspicion, and the remembrance of the Crimea has dashed away a cloud of prejudice, and enlisted in their favour a host of sympathies. Brotherhoods stand on a very different footing—a footing surrounded with such practical difficulties that we believe the minds most deeply convinced of their value, nay, of their necessity, will shrink on experience from any sanguine hopes or bold prophecies, and be content with asking that they may be tried, attempted at least, before the idea is cast away as a dream, leaving it to God's Holy Spirit—the author of peace and lover of concord—who alone can make brethren to be of one mind in a house, to solve the problem. That the idea is essential to Christianity is clear. The apostolical body—the social life of the earliest converts, the organization of S. Paul's missionary movement, the theory of Christian worship, the very language of Christianity is stamped with the principle of community—of family life. That the wants which it supplies are felt at this day, as they were felt in the days of monasticism, is obvious. What are our religious societies, our charity dinners, our clubs, our poorhouses, our hospitals, our hotels, our joint-stock companies, our trusteeships, our dreams of socialism and communism, our schools, our colleges (real colleges and pretended colleges), our manufactories, our lodging-houses, our refuges, our boarding-houses, our armies, and camps, and barracks, our Great Eastern on the sea, and our railway establishments on land—what are half the advertisements in the *Times*, but proclamations of the necessity of gathering together, organizing and perpetuating bodies and communities of men to accomplish works and supply needs which are wholly beyond the reach of isolated individuals? Can Christ's Church neglect, dare to neglect, a principle so stamped as essential to human nature? What is all society but an aggregate of associations, not of individuals?

Why should the Church of Christ condemn itself to remain as a heap of grains of sand, and refuse to consolidate them into stones and rocks, on which to found and build up the temple of the Lord?

And when we look back to the ease and rapidity with which monastic bodies sprung up in the Middle Ages, we flatter ourselves that the experiment may be repeated. But perhaps the very first thing to be done by those who would attempt this is not only to distinguish carefully between the healthy and unhealthy growth of the monastic system, between its virtues and its sins; but also to realize fully the differences between the present age and those in which that system flourished, that we may realize the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of restoring the idea.

The first principle to be laid down and carefully guarded is this: there must be no tampering with the principle or development of family life. The family is the natural form of social community established by Providence. No experiment can succeed which rashly interferes with this. We must have no forced celibacy—no tempting of children from their parents and their homes—no withdrawal from active life of those who can serve God in Church and State in the bosom of families—no vows which bind men permanently to a form of life for which the change of circumstances, whether without or within, may render them afterwards unfit. Even these simple limitations, so obviously just and necessary that they seem mere truisms,

will deprive us of a vast amount of material from which "religious" communities were formerly organized. "Religious" brotherhoods must not venture to gather into them any but the individuals who are either destitute of families or unfitted for that form of life, or obliged to live without it, or able to do so without any neglect of active duties. Such fragments and chips as it were of society may be taken up and formed into a solid concrete of infinite value for the construction of the Church. But they can never supersede the family. And now think of the thousand impediments to the development of family life in the Middle Ages, and the thousand advantages which foster it in the present day in this country. Constant warfare, hourly insecurity and oppression, little trade or commerce, no profession but that of arms, no opportunity for study but under the shelter of the Church, no possibility of rising in society where the barriers of rank were so rigidly guarded, no facilities for social life, such as are supplied by our towns and neighbourhoods, settled quietly in peace and abundance—the criminal acts of warfare which drove many guilty consciences from their families into a sanctuary—the violation of the sanctities of domestic life so common in those days—the difficulty of providing for children—the superstitions which seduced men to think of purchasing heaven by donations to the Church, and by exaggerated asceticisms—the deep hold which religion with these excrescences had taken on the human mind—the noble, though morbidly exaggerated spirit of faith, and obedience, and devotion to a superior authority, and abnegation of self, which permeates the chivalry of those days—all these, and many more influences, were at work in former ages to withdraw men from domestic life, and to cast them into religious communities. Look round on England at this day, and observe how the very opposite conditions are developing domestic life, and thus rendering the formation of religious communities infinitely more difficult, and infinitely less necessary. Whatever is attempted now must be planned for a limited sphere, restricted in its range of duties, curtailed in the choice of materials, hampered in combining them, surrounded with prejudices and opposition, and precarious in its permanence. We are convinced most deeply of the solemn obligation of the Church of England to make the attempt, of the infinite value of the principle if it can be re-established among us, of the hopelessness of making any impression upon the mass of our population, or carrying out our plans of good without it. But we are equally convinced of the almost insurmountable difficulties which lie in our way, and of the duty of confronting them fully in order to surmount them. The end is good, the means lawful, the idea Christian. A higher power than our own can remove mountains before our path, restore our withered arms, multiply our few loaves in the wilderness, still the storm of strife, and bid even a lifeless Church come forth from the tomb, much more a sick and fevered one rise up from her bed and minister to Him. Let us make the attempt. But must it not be with many doubts, with hoping even against hope? Let us begin first not with a dream—not with a charming, romantic, picturesque imagination of "cloisters dim, and fretted aisles, and pealing anthems, and vested worshippers." Half the failures in the development of the Church system in these days has arisen from these dreams—from an effort to realize too much—and to transplant bodily into the nineteenth century a full-grown exotic, instead of trying the possibility of gradually acclimatizing the plant by raising it from a seed. The first obvious need of something like brotherhood is found in our populous parishes, especially in London. It is needed for the rector and curates of 30,000 inhabitants. Let us try it here. Our vision is a square brick rectory-house in any street in London—an ordinary rector, an ordinary wife, an ordinary domestic establishment, and an ordinary staff of curates. Is it possible to bring together a body of curates under the same roof with the rector—to live at the same table as one family, thus saving the expense of lodgings, diminishing the cost of board, economizing time, facilitating the division and arrangement of work, cheering and supporting the

solitary life of the curate, and strengthening the whole parochial administration by mutual sympathy, counsel, study and prayer? If a plan so simple, so feasible, so obviously unobjectionable as this is an idle dream—if the English mind in the nineteenth century cannot submit, for so great an object, to the little restraints and checks upon individual selfishness which such a plan would require, but which must be submitted to in every regulated family—if rectors, that is, and rectors' wives, will not sacrifice to such an end some portion of their domestic privacy, and curates some portion of their bachelor's independence, the question, we think, is answered, and brotherhoods are impossible; and no subtle organization, no bodies of statutes, no solemn and picturesque buildings, will generate that social spirit without which the labourers in the Church must continue a rope of sand.

There will undoubtedly be needed in such formations certain habits of thought, certain observances, the same which are stereotyped for all our collegiate associations, and the importance of which may not present themselves to the mind at first sight. We hope to suggest them another time. They will sound very common-place, savour little of romance and dreaming. But whoever has had any experience of common life, whether in a college or a monastery, a boarding-house or on board a ship, a family or a touring party, will acknowledge that they are not to be despised. Of one thing we feel sure, that the secret of success in the organization and re-establishment of brotherhoods, if re-established they ever can be in the English Church, will be found in a very simple, humble, practical, unromantic engrafting of them upon existing habits of life and existing forms of society, with which we are already familiar. They must be grown from seeds, and grown not in hot-beds, but in the open air.

Pews and Free Sittings.



HIS subject was not quite clearly disposed of at the Oxford Congress. It was, indeed, the one defect in the arrangements of the Congress that it attempted too much, and dealt with so many important matters that it was not possible to give sufficient time for the complete handling and discussion of any one of them. The Oxford Congress, as the Cambridge, has had excellent effects in promoting good mutual understanding, and, in many respects, unity of thought and purpose; but if such assemblies of Churchmen are to have a permanent influence in guiding the public mind, they must be content with taking in hand one, or at most two, principal subjects, and dealing with them upon the exhaustive principle.

Now, the pew-system is one thing. Allotment of sittings to parishioners by churchwardens is another thing. A church with all the sittings free and unappropriated is a third thing.

We hope and believe that the time is not far off when pews,—that is, square or otherwise shaped enclosures in churches with doors to them,—will be a thing hard to find. It is one of the most hopeful signs of the present time that the evils of the pew-system are beginning to be recognized by all schools and parties in the Church. As the "pew-system" is commonly understood, it is an invasion of the rights of the poor which nothing can justify, and it contradicts the very principle of a National Church, which is, that all orders and degrees of men amongst us have free access to "the houses of God in the land."

The allotment of sittings to parishioners is a different matter.

Allotment of the sittings of a church by the churchwardens, who are the officers of the Ordinary for this purpose, is not the pew-system. It is the system of the Church of England, which the pew-system is not. In making such allotment care should be taken, and commonly is taken, not to separate members of the same

household. The unity of the family should be respected. Allotment of seats is a principal feature of the parochial system, and is to be made from time to time, as need arises, by the churchwardens. Where the provision of seats is not equal to the number of claimants there must be, of course, some order of precedence in the allotment, and the details of the arrangement will vary more or less according to the character of the population. The main principle to act upon in all cases is this—that the whole area of a parish church be made as available as possible for the uses of the parishioners; the churchwardens in every parish being the officers charged with making the necessary allotment or arrangement from time to time, with appeal to the bishop. If the utmost is done which it is in the power of the churchwardens to do, and yet there be not room for all, none will have any just ground of complaint, but all will then have forced upon them the necessity of extending the existing accommodation. All sale of sittings, and all renting of sittings in a parish church is illegal; and it cannot be denied that the Ordinaries of the Church have been much to blame for allowing the practice to grow up to the extent in which it has prevailed, and in some places prevails still. It is one instance, out of many, of the fact that, where abuses exist in Church or State, it is not by any means so much the individual perpetrators of the abuse as the authorities who have long connived at, or even sanctioned it, who are to blame. In proprietary chapels and churches, under any special act providing for payment for sittings, the case is of course a different one.

The question of churches with all the sittings free and unappropriated is a third and a distinct question. The plan is not applicable except in towns, and even there it is full of great difficulties, and often proves a failure in respect of its primary object, that of providing sittings for the poor. When a church is built with all its sittings free and unappropriated, of which in late years we have some magnificent examples, the same spirit which has prompted the building tends to throw every manner of attraction into the services. The natural result is that the Church is continually thronged with well-dressed people, and the poor have great difficulty in finding a place. And yet it is doubtless better to have it so than to have the old state of things in towns. In the country parishes the plan of sittings wholly unappropriated cannot be applied with any success. There the points to be secured, if possible, are:—

1st. The sweeping away of pews.

2nd. The uniform seating of the church so as to give the greatest amount of accommodation in the best way.

3rd. The regular supervision and allotment of the sittings by the churchwardens.

If a large proportion of the sittings are not actually allotted among the poor, it will be found that, nevertheless, the same persons always sit in the same place. It will be found, too, that the instinctive delicacy of the poor man will not readily allow him to place himself in his richer neighbour's vacant place.

It is probable that if the sittings of *all* churches in a town were wholly free and unappropriated, and the services in all alike well and efficiently conducted, this would be the best solution of the town difficulty. Meantime, we are thankful to see such churches built. But it must be borne in mind that this is a supplementing of the parochial system where this fails under pressure of local circumstances and exigencies, and not a part of its original principle, which should be carefully maintained wheresoever it is possible to maintain it, both in town and country. The parochial system in respect of sittings in churches is the system of regular allotment to the full extent of the capacity of the church by the churchwardens, always taking care that the poor have an ample share. Churches wholly free and unappropriated cannot come into the place of this system, nor compete with it in point of public advantage as an universal rule.

The Musical Season.



MUSIC may, on the whole, be said to have been tolerably represented this season. It will, indeed, probably, be found that quantity has generally been better received than quality; but it cannot fairly be complained that a respectable standard has not been maintained throughout a very exceptional year. It is, however, abundantly evident that the demand for good music does not in the least depend upon the coming together of all nations at Brompton, and it is in every way satisfactory to see how far some people will go after harmony. There have been during the past few months plenty of unexceptionable interpreters of any order of music, and if there has seemed to be anything wanting, it has been a first class work to interpret. Music, it is likely, will take little or nothing by a succession of International Exhibitions; but it is, perhaps, remarkable that a conspicuously competitive year should have given us nothing that will ever live. Meyerbeer and Auber were, it is true, in a way, represented on the first of May; but putting aside some of the merits that must be found in the scores of such masters, it was impossible not to feel that they brought no particular *kudos* to great names. They were played as well as they could be, better, and indeed louder, than they could have been anywhere else; and after the offering of the professor of music at Cambridge had been respectfully listened to, it is not improbable that Mr. Costa might have thought that his enemy had done the next worst thing for himself to writing a book. The "cantata" of Signor Verdi, which was with real official bad taste refused a hearing, would, it is evident, from the reception it has since received, have carried off the honours at the opening ceremonial; and, although Mr. Mapleson had clearly no business to give it at an establishment which was once above the representation of sensation cantatas, it was—out of place—discovered that Signor Verdi had been writing almost up to his best efforts. Composed for an immense area, and for the glorious voice of Signor Tamberlik, its effect in a comparatively cramped space, and altered to meet the resources of Mdlle. Titiens, was a long way removed from what it would have been; but as one of the original works of the year, it will very likely be remembered as long as the year lasts—a longer claim upon the memory than will be achieved by any other work of the past season. The big room in S. James's Hall has never been able to hold all who have gone to the Monday Popular Concerts. They have not, perhaps, so completely succeeded because they deserved to be entirely successful, for it is not observable that there is always a higher appreciation of good music than there is of anything else with really solid claims; but the directors of the Monday Popular Concerts are clearly entitled to all the merit of having brought the people—who were tolerating bad music rather than go without—to sit out a programme that offered none of the frivolities that generally reach the importance of being nationally hummed. It was even remarkable that the best things found the readiest way to their fancy, and not even any of the usual apologies for the absence of Mr. Sims Reeves prevented their sitting everything out and wanting more.

The appearance of Herr Joachim has been almost *the* instrumental event of the season, and as it is, he has only been separated from realizing a monopoly of "instrumental" interest by the return of M. Thalberg. Whilst there was no doubt at all that Herr Joachim played better than ever, M. Thalberg, it is likely enough, was of opinion that if he had improved, his "form" had always been such that he need not show it. There was nothing wanting but room enough to hear them in, and the appearance of these two great *artistes* would alone have served to make the season in every way a memorable one. Whilst it would be impossible to chronicle every event of musical interest, it must not be forgotten that the Sacred Harmonic Society

has managed to satisfy most people. In an age when almost every levity has a leader it may at first perplex most moralists to explain the contemporaneous zest for sacred music. It is, however, incontestable that the man who not many years since was only to be got to listen to the music that was wedded to indecent rhyme is to be now found listening with rapture to the sublime *Messiah*. The attractions of musical London are hardly anywhere now exceptionable; and those who not long since would never have missed a tainted ballad take care never to be far from the splendid works that the Sacred Harmonic offers. Nor is the result one that merely contributes to a better appreciation of the highest music. There may be those who, at first only touched by a chord, have remained possessed by the influence that makes music in its essence a thing of Heaven: and it is not impossible that after a while the best works of the Sacred Harmonic may be brought before the million. It is scarcely possible to believe that the crowds that were attracted to Sydenham by the Handel Festival would a few years since have gone there in any such force to hear *sacred* music. But the change in this direction has been all for the best, and the great festival of the season has recorded the supremacy of the sublimest music in the public heart. Without going into details, the Handel Festival was from first to last a great national success achieved before all nations. The choruses went magnificently; and not one out of that vast aggregate of throats seemed to forget a single obligation to tune. Some of the solos could not well have been better; but Mr. Sims Reeves, who really never sings easily above A in *alt.*, was not throughout, it seemed to us, singing his best. His great effect was, as usual, *Sound an Alarm*; but we scarcely ever remember him to have sung it with less effect. Whilst Mr. Sims Reeves gives this song better perhaps than any other English singer now before the public, the recollection of Signor Tamberlik's incomparable chest notes in these pure Handelian phrases was not to be got rid of; but the success of such a festival as that at Sydenham is not to be judged by a single overrated voice that was overtaxed; and it is impossible at this date to dispute any of the evidences that confirmed the good points of an endeavour to honour Handel's memory, and that pre-eminently honoured itself in so magnificent a tribute to his great name. Whilst appearances of rare interest have crowded on each other, there was never any danger of Madame (Lind) Goldsmidt being merely well received; nor was there any who had need to be reminded that she came again amongst us to do good. This admirable lady was entirely able to satisfy everybody; but if some of her nightingale notes were not what they were, there is yet so beautiful a remainder that every memory was awakened of the supremacy that fairly upset Madame Grisi's throne before any of the "Farewell" improprieties at Covent Garden began. Jenny Lind—when she could have taken liberties—never outraged good manners or good taste; and there was always something on the side of charity that moved the exquisite voice that once convulsed a season. Her reception was magnificent, and her re-appearance would alone have made the musical season a marked one.

In other directions there is more to record in the way of the confirmation of old excellencies than in the introduction of new favourites. Mr. Gye's great establishment has presented all the evidences of its strength, and all opposition has probably disastrously recoiled on itself. With the exception of the introduction of Mdlle. Trebelli, Mr. Mapleson has not in any way shown cause why his suddenly-conceived enterprise should have taken the public with it. The announcements that were imposingly paraded in his programme have been only exceptionally carried out, and the vague and pretentious references to striking events in preparation have remained with remarkable uniformity a matter of mystery. Mdlle. Titiens (who, by the way, asked too much for Mr. Gye) has almost alone kept Mr. Mapleson from closing, the singing of Signor Giuglini throughout the season having been very unreliable. It is not easy to understand how resolutely this gentleman sets

himself against any improvement in his style, and, with the best light tenor voice of the day, has so little of the intelligence of a really great *artiste*. Signor Mario, with some three notes left in his register, is, when the three notes will act, a very superior singer to Signor Giuglini; and it is curious to see at how great a disadvantage the better voice appears by the side of the better method. Signor Giuglini's languor is, however, undeniably popular, and it does not say a great deal for the age that where there is so little manliness there are so many followers.

Mdlle. Trebelli, it is not too much to believe, is the best *mezzo-soprano* since Madame Alboni, and, as a pure singer, shows conspicuously amongst Mr. Mapleson's other "unparalleled" engagements. Mr. Gye (who has had nothing to fear from the opposition) has passed through perhaps his very best season. He has been only tolerably scrupulous in the realization of his programme, but he has given us some of the greatest works as we can hear them nowhere else—although we might have *heard* more at times but for Mr. Costa's predilection for loud orchestration. The slight to some of our first singers has been continued in the interest of Mdlle. Patti, and old favourites have been set aside that the newest *furore* might not be hindered. Mdlle. Adelina Patti is almost all that her critics have pronounced her, but she has not nearly filled the place of Madame Angiolina Bosio. This year, to our fancy, a tendency to exaggerate has sometimes almost spoiled her; but it is not very likely that whilst this young lady continues to be the town talk she will be at any pains to divert the enthusiasm which greets her very few faults.

Madame Grisi's absence has not been wholly without apprehension that she might make some more "positively final" appearances, but her retirement has happily been preserved, and a real cause of thankfulness has not been disturbed. Mdlle. Fricci (whose services, we understand, are re-engaged) has divided the "heavy business" with Mdlle. Csillag, and, with a fresh and beautiful voice, is not at all unlikely to reach a high standard. If Signor Mario has satisfied his friends, he has certainly not confounded his enemies. Time after time his voice has failed him, and he has been left to dumb-show to carry him through. This sort of exhibition seems to us to be entirely a manager's question, and it will soon be a powerful attraction to announce the appearance of singers who have some time ceased to be able to sing. Mr. Gye, who has not been able to rely either on Signor Mario or Signor Gardoni, has fortunately still been able to secure the splendid services of the greatest of tenors. Signor Tamberlik (who has been in superb voice throughout) has been revelling in the full power of his surpassing gifts, and has been singing up to C. sharp in *alt.* (in itself an unparalleled feat) with almost greater ease and resonance than ever. The truth is that without this noble Roman Mr. Gye could hardly keep open; and it is not too much to say that but few of the greatest works could be given at all were it not for the sympathetic tones of Emanuel Tamberlik. None of the emergencies of a very trying season have found him unprepared; and whilst no singer who was ever heard could approach his manly energy, he has given to agony a reality of musical expression that before he came was new to art. Signor Tamberlik has stood alone throughout a year that, instrumentally or vocally, would seem to have offered something to every one and to have left its claims on all.

The Lay Element in America.



THE first problem to be solved by the small remnant of Churchmen left in America at the close of the Revolutionary war was, what shall be the position of the laity in regard to Church affairs? We do not call this the most important problem: for the most important was, beyond all question, how to obtain the Episcopate. But we call it the first, for it was

the first to come up for a practical solution; and the only possible solution seemed to be so evident that the problem settled itself without any trouble whatever, and with not even a serious question.

According to the theory of the Anglican Church, the consent of the laity, as represented by the Crown in Parliament, is requisite for the legal enforcement of every important part of Church legislation and Church administration. Without the Royal writ no Convocation can assemble. Without the Royal licence no Convocation, when assembled, can enact canons. When enacted, canons cannot be made binding on the whole body of Churchmen except by act of Parliament. Even the Prayer-book itself—Creeds included—relies for its legal force upon act of Parliament making that to be the law of the land which Convocation has set forth, but to which Convocation, while thus setting it forth, cannot of its own power give the sanction of law. These are essential points in a Church established by law, that is, a National Church; and these the Americans considered—not indeed altogether correctly—as settling for them the principle that the laity should have a co-ordinate voice in every part of Church legislation. Moreover, the English system of episcopal appointments gives the whole power of nomination to the Crown, the work of the dean and chapter in electing being simply formal. The patronage of church-livings is also in great part in the hands either of the Crown or of individual laymen. Accordingly, the American laity from the first exercised a voice in the choice of bishops and the appointment of rectors. In regard to the election of bishops the clergy obtained a free voice. In America the clergy as the laity vote for any person they prefer, and can—for any reason, or for no reason—refuse to accept the one who may be most popular with the laity. In some dioceses, as in Pennsylvania for instance, the clergy have the right of choosing first, and the man thus chosen then comes before the laity to be confirmed or rejected as they please: and very seldom does any rejection take place.

This participation of the laity was under the circumstances so natural that it seems to have taken place as a matter of course. The same circumstances have extended the participation to questions of doctrine. To this there is no parallel in the mother country. For the rest, there being no one dominant religious body, and the Church herself being a very small and mutilated fragment, any thing like a union between Church and State was simply impossible: and unless the laity had been admitted, the position of the Crown in Parliament in England would have had no counterpart at all in the Church of America. Such an entire departure from the English model and English ideas was not to have been expected in those days. And precisely the same conclusion was reached from an opposite direction: for since the whole framework of Church polity was necessarily to rest, in America, upon the voluntary support of Churchmen, the admission of the laity was as inevitable as it is among us in any voluntary Church enterprise. The existence of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Church Missionary Society, and all similar enterprises, even down to the more purely ecclesiastical affairs of Church unions, and ecclesiological and architectural societies,—all these have a large representation of the laity in their governing bodies; and the continued existence of their energy and influence would be impossible without it. Whether regarded as the only possible imitation of the Anglican system therefore, or as the result of a merely voluntary organization, the admission of the laity was indispensable. It is matter of admiration, all things considered, that the clergy preserved a co-ordinate power: and that before long a complete negative was given to the House of Bishops, upon every act of clergy and laity together.

Historically we find the lay element appearing with the first germs of the organization known in America as the General Convention. In May, 1784, some of the clergy

of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, met in the city of New Brunswick, N. J., in pursuance of previous correspondence;—the immediate object of the meeting being the revival of a charitable corporation which had existed before the Revolution. But as the subject of the organization of the Church of America was to be discussed, “there being a few respectable lay members of the Church attending on public business in the same city, their presence was desired.” The result of this was a larger meeting in October of the same year, the members of which were not regularly sent as deputies, or clothed with powers to bind any one by their conclusions. They agreed on issuing and recommending for consideration several articles of organization, of which the second ran thus:—“That the Episcopal Church in each State send deputies to the [General] Convention, consisting of clergy and laity;” and the sixth provided that “the clergy and laity assembled in Convention shall deliberate in one body, but shall vote separately; and the concurrence of both shall be necessary to give validity to every measure.” These features have ever since remained a fixed part of the American system of Church legislation, and they are reproduced in the organization of each diocesan convention from Maine to California.

According to the American idea, therefore, that which is “the State” in our union of “Church and State” is represented by the laity in the organization of their Church system: and there is left to the civil government in that country only that which is considered purely secular. The American theory requires that religious affairs—that is to say, matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship—shall be left to religious bodies only, to be managed by themselves without let or hindrance, so long as nothing is done contrary to public morals. With some exceptions, the General Government has carried out the idea very fairly. The State Governments have been much less consistent: and, reserving all powers not expressly surrendered to the General Government, some of them continued for a longer or shorter time their colonial enactments on the subject of religion. In several States the laws prejudicial to Romanists were long retained, though now universally done away. And, strangely enough, Massachusetts—whose Puritans claim to have been the original inventors of “religious liberty,”—Massachusetts was the last to retain on the Statute-book laws compelling a certain proportion of support to Congregationalist ministers; nor was the latest vestige of these laws swept away until the year 1834.

The State, however, claims and exercises the power to interfere where individual rights or the rights of property are concerned, and to see that justice is done by the officers of the Church, according to Church-law. For instance:—a few years ago a clergyman of the diocese of New York, who was accused of gross immorality, was tried by a Church-court, found guilty, and condemned to be deposed from the ministry; and a day was set for the public act of deposition to be performed. The culprit, who had already taxed the powers of the civil courts in worrying those who were enforcing the discipline of the Church, finally applied for an injunction against the Provisional Bishop of New York, on the allegation that the canons of the Church in regard to trials had been violated in his case. An injunction was granted, and the bishop was restrained from deposing the man, until he had first appeared before the court, and proved to its satisfaction that the canons had been duly complied with: whereupon the injunction was dissolved, and the deposition was effected.

The American theory is, with some most important qualifications, a very pretty theory: but in the large range of subjects—marriage, divorce, education, observance of Sunday, blasphemous publications, and such like—in which there is both a religious and a secular element, the practical result is that the civil government, which is *one*, takes *the whole*: and the religious organizations, which are many, and cannot be made to act together, retain *nothing*. So far as the Church is concerned, however, every approach to an alliance with the State must be destructive.

Our own Parliament, which is composed of a vast majority of Churchmen, and where Churchmen make up the great majority of the people, still requires careful watching. What then could be expected in America, where the vast majority of the people and of Congress do not belong to the Church, and where the President—as is actually the case with President Lincoln—may be an unbaptized man? The relations of the Church in America to the civil power are those, and none other, which subsist between the Church and a heathen government not persecuting the Church, but protecting alike the temporal interests of all its citizens. “*No union of Church and State*” is, therefore, the true Churchman’s rallying cry in America, as emphatically as “*Church and State*” is ours in England; and, so long as that country is governed by a Democracy on principles of universal suffrage, it will never be otherwise.

Suffragan Bishops.



T appears to be a general opinion that the recent Oxford Congress—in many and important points a great success—failed, in respect of discussion, from attempting too much. Too many subjects were taken in hand, and some kindred subjects were crowded together. Time and energies were alike insufficient.

The question of the “Increase of the Episcopate” supplies one instance of our meaning. Ably as this subject was introduced by Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope, it had to be discussed at the same sitting with the “Extension of the Ministry,” and “Regulated Lay Ministry,” upon which papers of great value and interest were read—the first by Professor Harold Browne, and the second by Mr. Massingberd. The result of this arrangement was this—neither of the three subjects had justice done to it; each fared alike in the brief and partial discussion which it underwent. Our object now is to notice the discussion of the first only of these subjects; for while we attach great importance to the other two subjects, we do not hesitate to say that their importance is small compared with that of the first; and further, that the adoption of the valuable suggestions in the two papers of Professor H. Browne and Mr. Massingberd is more likely to be brought about by an extension of the episcopate than by any other means; because the active life which is sure to be kindled in a new diocese, and the increased leisure which the bishop of a diocese more contracted than our old dioceses would obtain, are all in favour of that active zeal and that patient deliberation by which alone any new ministerial agencies can be duly considered and matured for adoption. And yet this question of increasing the episcopate is still, as it appears to us, in a condition which is neither satisfactory nor creditable to the Church of England. We are not about to dwell on the fact that 300 years ago our Reformers proposed to erect ten more sees, and that only one additional see has been founded in England since that time, although the population of the country is now five times as great as it was then. We wish to put the case in another way. If the rector or vicar of a parish has grown old, or is debilitated by sickness, or has a population so large that the proper discharge of his duties is beyond his strength, the law compels him to keep a curate. He may be poor, but nevertheless he is compelled to have assistance; and rightly, as we believe, because the Church may not sacrifice the welfare of the many to the interests of the individual priest. But a bishop may be advanced in years, or weighed down by sickness, or he may have a diocese larger by half a million of souls than was ever before entrusted to any bishop; and yet there is no law, either of the Church or of the State, to compel him to supplement his own powers by the aid of a colleague or coadjutor. Two examples of this have lately appeared in the public papers. A bishop of advanced age is stated to have held no visitation of his diocese for four years. In the same diocese one of the archdeacons, in consequence of illness, has been incapacitated for the labours of his visitation for the same period.

In this case both the bishop and the archdeacon are men of exemplary zeal and piety, and we mention the case simply as an illustration of the deficiency in our ecclesiastical law to meet the necessities which arise out of such cases. Again, “900 young persons were lately summoned to a church at the West-end of London to be confirmed there at one service.” Many parents, friends, and sponsors were obliged to go away, and the crowd was so great that the candidates could only get into the church with great difficulty and with the aid of the police. We have never seen anything quite so bad as this; though we have painful recollections of the crowded state of the country town on the morning of a confirmation, as we have also of the busy zeal of the verger to pack the altar-rail as closely as possible in order to spare the bishop two or three rails-full in addition to the forty or fifty which were inevitable. Who does not feel shame and sorrow at these things? Where is the remedy? Clearly, in the sub-division of the more populous dioceses, and in providing one or more suffragans in all. But how is this to be effected? Mr. Hope recommends “agitation;” and our readers will perceive that we are doing at once as he recommends. Another loyal layman proceeded to the point more briefly, as though the agitation had already done its work. “The dean and chapter,” he said, “were anciently regarded as the bishop’s council and assistants; the archdeacons are also his especial officers; so also the rural deans, who were in old times consecrated bishops for the discharge of such episcopal functions as the bishop of the diocese thought fit, from time to time, to require of them. Let these all be made bishops in aid of the existing bishop, and then we may have an annual confirmation in every parish in the kingdom, besides affording to the bishop of the diocese greater leisure for the careful discharge of all his other duties.” We presume that in thus speaking of the rural dean our lay brother was alluding to the chor-episcopus, of whom the rural dean is believed to be the successor, and who was in early ages a country bishop and coadjutor to the urban bishop of the diocese. In thus noticing the advice of Alderman Bennett, we feel it right to say that we are heartily with him in the principle which he espouses, though not in his mode of carrying it into practice. We believe it to be possible to have too many bishops as well as too few; and our amendment on his suggestion would be this:—Let the bishop select either from his dean and chapter, his archdeacons, or his rural deans, one, two, or three priests, to be consecrated as his suffragans, according to the act 26 Henry VIII. c. 14. (See *Brett’s Suffragan Bishops and Rural Deans*, edited by the Rev. James Fendall.) Let him thus give to his diocese annual confirmations in churches less distant from one another than is now usually the practice; he himself, if his strength permit, confirming, as is now usually the case, throughout the diocese once in every three years; and we believe he would thus confer on every faithful parish priest the greatest possible help in that part of his work which relates to the younger members of his flock. We estimate the value of such a boon to the Church so highly that we think it is our bounden duty to agitate for it in all becoming ways. And yet we would respectfully, but most earnestly, say to our bishops—Why compel us to use weapons which we take up with deep reluctance? Why should the bishops of the Church of England be themselves the last to give serious heed to this great and pressing question? And why compel both clergy and people to force from them a boon which, as it seems to every one else, they ought to be the foremost and the most prompt to supply?

The Northern Convocation.



QUAINT writer of old once suggested that the hand of York was wont to point to the dial of Canterbury; thus meaning, in no very friendly spirit to the English Church, to insinuate that the Northern Convocation had not always enjoyed that

full and fair share of authority which it is its undoubted right and unquestionable privilege to exercise. We should be deeply concerned if this sneer were in future to be justly deserved. The division of the Church into Provincial Jurisdictions we believe to be of Apostolic origin. It has been the form of government prevailing in the Church of England, in all ages of her history, and is now entailed upon this generation, consecrated by the most venerable sanctions. That the province of York, therefore, may take its full share and exert all its just authority, in whatever deliberations or measures may be needful for the protection and guidance of the Church of England, is our very earnest hope; and that hope has been fortified of late by the revival of its Synods under the authority of the revered and excellent prelate who now presides over them.

But if in the affairs of the English Church the Convocation of York is to exercise its proper and legitimate influence it must be careful of the internal guidance to which it submits itself. Some caution here is no more than necessary. For we confess to very considerable disappointment in witnessing the course which that Synod had been induced to pursue with reference to the 29th Canon and the Harvest Service. The 29th Canon, as amended by the Convocation of Canterbury, was transmitted to York in order that the latter Synod might deliberate on the subject. But the conclusion there arrived at in the Upper House, and agreed to in the Lower, with only an expression of unavailing regret, was—that the Synod “*does not consider it expedient at present to enter upon the discussion of that question.*” Now we give no opinion at this moment, one way or the other, as to the desirableness of the change proposed in the 29th Canon.* We only desire now to express a conviction that it is a matter which deserved rather to be fairly discussed than idly shelved.

A like course was pursued in reference to the Harvest Service also, transmitted from Canterbury, for the approbation of the sister Synod. The Bishop of Manchester proposing and carrying the following resolution in the Upper House at York:—“*That until better informed than at present as to the power of the Crown to grant a licence for the use of such a Service,*” (this House) “*deems it expedient, while fully convinced of the propriety and desirableness of returning special thanks to Almighty God for His mercies vouchsafed, to defer the consideration of the form of prayer proposed.*”

Thus it is observable on the very first occasion, for at least a century and a half, when the York Synod was placed, under the auspices of its present president, in a position to discuss practical matters of vital interest and importance to the English Church, that it straightway declined the duty. In the first instance, the whole Synod did not “consider it expedient to enter upon the discussion of the question:” in the second instance, the Bishop of Manchester induced the Upper House to resolve that it was “expedient . . . to defer the consideration of the form of prayer proposed.” One of the speakers, indeed, in the Lower House volunteered the opinion that “it would be most advantageous if the manliness and vigour which characterized the proceedings of the Northern Province were infused into the deliberations of the Southern Province.” But if of late years these heroic qualities had found their expression with the Canterbury Convocation in deeming it inexpedient to enter upon the discussion, and in deeming it expedient to defer the consideration of such questions deeply affecting the Church, as have been from time to time brought before it, we confess to considerable misgivings as to the advantages which would have accrued. On the other hand, we incline to the opinion that the Southern Province has, against many discouragements, obtained a success which her Northern sister has shown herself somewhat backward in supporting.

* It is the Editor's opinion, which he thinks it necessary to express in this place, that the Convocation of York has done very wisely in refusing to enter upon the discussion of the proposed alteration in 29th Canon.—*Note by Editor.*

But however this may be, our present special object is to call attention to the remarkably odd reason on which the Bishop of Manchester professedly grounded a refusal to take the proposed Harvest Service into consideration. That reason was a confessed lack of information as to the power of the Crown to grant a licence, as the bishop termed it, for the use of such service.

We here pass briefly over the strange notion involved in this resolution that a royal licence is any way needful for the purpose in view. For, however necessary it may be to assure the author of the resolution that a royal licence in constitutional language is requisite for the following purposes, and for those purposes only, viz:—“the attempting, alledging, claiming, or putting in ure any old Canons, or the enacting, promulging, or executing any new Canons,”—yet we are quite sure that it is altogether unnecessary to detain our readers over so very notorious a fact. For what reason the idea of a licence was introduced at all it is very hard to see. If the term, bearing its definite and specific sense, was deliberately used in reference to the promulgation of an Occasional Service, it must be said that the composition then betrays a remarkably slender acquaintance with Ecclesiastical or Constitutional law. If, on the other hand, the term was only carelessly and undistinguishingly thrown in, in order to signify generally the royal assent, then it may occur to some minds that a little more caution would not have been misplaced in drawing up a grave Synodical document.

However, to waive this point of the somewhat surprising form of the resolution under view, we revert to the very odd reason on which the refusal to take the Harvest Service into consideration was professedly grounded by the Bishop of Manchester. That reason was nothing more nor less than an acknowledged lack of information on a matter which is as clear as the broad daylight of history can make it, and is within the practical experience of every clergyman who has for any considerable time had charge of a parish.

Occasional Services, of which, indeed, four examples were until lately bound up with our English Prayer-book, have, at least for three centuries, been constantly put forth and used on occasions of national thanksgiving, or national humiliation. Of a royal licence for such a purpose, as suggested by the Bishop of Manchester, we certainly confess never before to have heard. But the instances of royal proclamations for this end are so numerous that it would be quite out of the question to give here a list of them at length. Neither the Tudor nor the Caroline statutes of Uniformity were ever supposed by any one of competent information to preclude the appointment of Occasional Services. From the date of the Service intitled “*an Office for Fasting on account of the Rebellion,*” published in the first year of King Edward VI, 1549, down to the year 1859, when “*a Form of Thanksgiving for the Suppression of the Indian Mutiny,*” was used in our churches, instances have been of constant recurrence, those statutes notwithstanding.

To give a few examples merely by way of specimens. In January, 1549, the first Statute of Uniformity was passed. Yet in that very year was issued “*an Office for Fasting on account of the Rebellion,*”—and in the next year (according to Strype), “*a Prayer against Drought to be used on a public fasting day in the Churches.*” In 1558 the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity was passed. Yet, in the following year, 1559, was prescribed “*the Service to be used in Procession on Rogation days.*” Next year, 1560, there was issued the service intitled, “*Celebratio Cænæ Domini in funebribus,*” and to the Royal sanction for its use are appended the following remarkable words:—“*Statuto illo prædicto (i. e. the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity) anno primo regni nostri promulgato in contrarium non obstante.*”

Upon the principle here plainly asserted, that the Crown could authorize the use of Special Services, “*Statuto non obstante,*” we trace from this date a long and varied series of Special Services, in which the people were invited to deprecate God's anger in national afflictions, and to offer

up their thanksgivings for national mercies. It would be beyond the space now at our disposal to specify in detail; it may suffice here to say that several were published in the reign of King James I, and several in that of King Charles I, and that proclamations for their use appear, among others, in the years 1625, 1626, 1628, and 1641.

In 1662 our present Statute of Uniformity was passed. Yet during the whole of the reign of King Charles II. the precedents were followed, which had before prevailed, of appointing Special Services, "*Statuto non obstante*." Instances occurred in the years 1664, 1665, twice in 1678, and once in 1679. During the brief reign of King James II. instances of Special Services again occurred, the proclamations generally following the usual terms, "by and with the advice of Council," and the preparation of the forms of prayer to be used being remitted to the Spirituality. In the reign of King William and Queen Mary many instances of Special Services are found—two in 1689, one in 1690, one in each year to 1697, and others in 1699 and in 1701. In all these cases, except one, directions being given to the Spirituality to compose a form.

It is really unnecessary to specify the series of precedents any further: it may suffice to say that there now lies before us a list of eighteen Special Services appointed during the latter half of the last century, beginning with "*a Thanksgiving for the taking of Louisburg, in 1758*;" and ending with "*a Thanksgiving for the victory of Aboukir, in 1798*:" and that, as regards the present century, "a return of the occasions on which Special Services have been used in England," lately moved for in the House of Commons by Mr. Cubitt, the member for West Surrey, and ordered to be printed, shows that twenty-five such Services have been prepared and used since the year 1800. To that return, moreover, a foot-note is added, in which it is stated that there have been also several instances of thanksgivings directed by Orders in Council, in addition to those authorized by proclamations.

From the foregoing matter it is clear enough, if the several Statutes of Uniformity are to be interpreted according to the usage prevailing through more than 300 years, according to universal and uninterrupted acquiescence both in Parliament and in the courts of law, and according to the general consent and understanding of the nation at large, that no real obstacle exists to the appointment of Special Services for special occasions, by the usual authority and in the usual way.

Whether such services should be compiled by primates themselves, or by metropolitans with the help of their suffragans, or by synodical committees, we will not now inquire, because the solitary question raised in the Northern Convocation was as to the appointment of occasions for their use; and that was a question with which the Synod went out of its way to trouble itself. Its manifest business was to assent to the Harvest Service as transmitted, if approved of; to authorize amendments, if not satisfactory. But, instead of doing either one or the other, a public proclamation was needlessly put forth of insufficient information on a collateral matter, and that, we must add, a matter which a very slender amount of ecclesiastical, or historical, or constitutional knowledge would have rendered unmistakeably clear.

We are very unwilling to allow ourselves to suspect, even for a moment, that there existed in any minds a lurking jealousy of the new Harvest Service by reason of its Synodical origin: and that, consequently, this proclaimed lack of information was paraded in order to veil Erastian prejudices, and to delay the completion of a boon to Christian worshippers, for which they would be thankful to the Church in her corporate capacity. However, in any case, if the York Convocation means to exercise its legitimate influence in the ecclesiastical counsels of this nation, some caution as to the guidance to which it submits itself is no more than necessary; and above all things it must abstain from adopting, at anybody's dictation, public professions of ignorance which the most superficial inquiries would have sufficed to dispel. At the outset we

said that we should be sorry to see old Fuller's sneer justified: and the independent condition of existence which we earnestly desire that the Northern Convocation may maintain, in more respects than one, may be briefly expressed in the poet's words—

"Nullius addictus jurare in Verba Magistri."

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

SERVIAN AFFAIRS.

"Earl Russell to Prince Michael Obrenovitch.

"Foreign Office, July 23, 1862.

PRINCE,—The Government of Her Majesty the Queen have heard with great concern of the events which have taken place at Belgrade. It appears that an attack was made by the Servians on the gates of the town, occupied by the Turks in virtue of ancient usage and recent treaties, especially the Treaty of Paris of 1856. Two of these gates having been carried by assault, the Consuls persuaded the Turks to evacuate the remaining two, in all four gates. But no sooner had the Turkish residents left their houses than those houses were plundered by a disorderly mob. For this pillage and disorder no redress was offered by the Servian authorities, and the next morning muskets were fired at the garrison in the citadel. Upon this occurrence the Pasha took the alarm, and unadvisedly, and, as it appeared to Her Majesty's Government, unjustifiably, bombarded the town at intervals for four hours. It is no wonder that peaceable inhabitants were seized with panic and left the town. But so far as Her Majesty's Government are informed, these lamentable events had their origin in the violation by the Servians of the relations established by treaties between the Sublime Porte and Servia. Your Highness assumes merit for not having joined in the insurrection of the Herzegovina. Your Highness deserves the credit of having, in that respect, shown regard to the obligations of good faith. If your Highness will, in the same spirit, conform to the duties imposed upon you by European treaties, Her Majesty's Government will most willingly use their influence with the Sublime Porte for the improvement of the condition of a million of Servians, in whose welfare Her Majesty the Queen takes a deep interest. But so long as ill-intentioned persons are allowed to draw your Highness into measures of defiance and of violence, in open violation and contempt of solemn treaties, it is impossible that Her Majesty's Government can ask the Sultan to give to his enemies means for assailing the security of his empire.

"I am, &c.

"RUSSELL."

AMERICA. — FEDERAL MONEY. — Announcement made on the 25th of July that the Post Office is not to issue postage-stamps for currency, but that the Treasury is to issue them on thick paper or cardboard ungummed, so that they cannot be used for postal purposes, but for currency only. A Treasury-note for a sum so low as one cent, or an English halfpenny! There are to be eight different kinds of notes (for if they are not to be available for the payment of postage they cannot justly be called postage-stamps), of which the following list and description has been published for general information and guidance:—

Amount	Vignette	Colour
1 cent	Franklin	Blue.
3 "	Washington	Pink.
5 "	Jefferson	Chocolate.
10 "	Washington	Green.
12 "	Washington	Black.
24 "	Washington	Lilac.
30 "	Franklin	Yellow.
90 "	Washington	Blue.

July 27.—The war steamer *Golden Gate*, which left San Francisco on the 21st of July for Panama, was burnt to the water's edge upon the 27th, off Manzanilla. She had 230 passengers, 180 of whom were lost, and 1,000,000 dols. in specie, which were also lost. A private despatch

says the steamer was beached, and there was a chance of saving her specie.

"Earl Russell to Mr. Stuart.

"Foreign Office, July, 28, 1862.

"SIR,—I have left hitherto unanswered and unnoticed a despatch of Mr. Seward's, (dated Washington, May 28, 1862,) which Mr. Adams delivered to me more than a month ago.

"I have done so partly because the military events referred to in it were, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, far from being decisive, and partly because there was no proposal in it upon which Her Majesty's Government were called upon to come to any conclusion.

"Events subsequent to the date of Mr. Seward's letter have shown that Her Majesty's Government in their opinion upon the first of these points were not mistaken. Victories have been gained, reverses have followed; positions have been reached in the near neighbourhood of the capital of the Confederates, and these positions have been again abandoned. These events have been accompanied by great loss of life in battle and in hospital, while such measures as the Confiscation Bill, passed through both Houses of Congress, and the proclamations of General Butler at New Orleans bear evidence of the increasing bitterness of the strife. The approach of a servile war, so much insisted upon by Mr. Seward in his despatch, only forewarns us that another element of destruction may be added to the slaughter, loss of property, and waste of industry which already afflict a country so lately prosperous and tranquil.

"Nor on the other point to which I have adverted have I anything new to say.

"From the moment when the intelligence first reached this country that nine States and several millions of inhabitants of the great American Union had seceded and had made war on the Government of the President down to the present time, Her Majesty's Government have pursued a friendly, an open, and a consistent course. They have been neutral between the two parties to a civil war. Neither the loss of the raw material of manufacture, so necessary to a great portion of our people, nor the insults constantly heaped upon the British name in speeches and newspapers, nor the rigour, beyond the usual practice of nations, with which the Queen's subjects attempting to break the loose blockade of the Southern ports have been treated, have induced Her Majesty's Government to swerve an inch from an impartial neutrality.

"At this moment they have nothing more at heart than to see that consummation of which the President speaks in his answer to the Governors of eighteen States—namely, the bringing of this unnecessary and injurious civil war to a speedy and satisfactory conclusion.

"As to the course of opinion in this country, the President is aware that perfect freedom of comment upon all public events is in this country the invariable practice, sanctioned by law, and approved by the universal sense of the nation.

"I am, &c.

"RUSSELL."

August 2.—New York, July 19.—The majority of the Border State members return a reply to the President unfavourable to his emancipation policy.

August 4.—Union Relief Aid Bill passed in the House of Lords.

August 3.—Turin.—Proclamation of Garibaldi in Sicily, urging the forcible occupation of Rome, and counter proclamation of Victor Emmanuel.

August 7.—Prorogation of Parliament.

A treaty of commerce and navigation, concluded between America and Turkey, has been officially proclaimed. Tobacco and salt are not included among the articles which the Americans are permitted to import into Turkey. No duty, however, will be levied upon tobacco or salt exported from Turkey by Americans.

August 9.—The *Correspondancia* of Madrid declares, on authority, that Spain has no intention at present of recognizing the kingdom of Italy.

August 13.—Belgium.—In the Chamber of Deputies the adoption of the commercial treaty between England and Belgium voted by a majority of 63; the numbers being 73 to 10.

August 15.—Garibaldian demonstrations in Milan and Naples.

August 20.—To-day, in the Senate, Signor Giulius requested an explanation from the Government of the recent events in Sicily.

Signor Rattazzi replied that the Government considered Garibaldi in a state of rebellion, and the situation of Sicily grave; but hoped that the difficulties would be surmounted. Signor Rattazzi also stated that, according to intelligence received from Messina, the communication between Catania and other towns was interrupted. General Mella, believing it to be the intention of Garibaldi to proceed to Messina, had intercepted the approach to that city. Garibaldi, however, profiting by the distance of the royal troops, rapidly directed his march towards Catania. The Government had sent troops to Catania, and the fleet being in the waters off the town to oppose any embarkation or disembarkation of volunteers, it was hoped that in a few days Sicily would be restored to its normal condition.

The Senate, after hearing Signor Rattazzi's explanations, adopted the following resolution:—"The Senate, convinced that the Minister will act with the greatest energy in order that the law and dignity of the Crown and Parliament be maintained intact, passes to the order of the day."

August 21.—Sicily has been proclaimed in a state of siege.

Belgium.—The Senate to-day voted the adoption of the commercial treaty with England by 26 against 6.

August 25.—Accounts of fighting in Virginia between the Federals under General Pope, and the Confederates under General Jackson. The advantage on the side of the Confederates.

August 26.—Paris, August 25.—The *Moniteur* says:—"Several newspapers have asked what will be the attitude of the French Government in view of the state of things in Italy. The answer is clear, and any doubt about it impossible. In the presence of insolent threats and the possible consequences of a demagogic insurrection, the duty of the French Government, and its military honour, oblige it more than ever to defend the Holy Father. The world must be well aware that France does not abandon those to whom, when in danger, she extends her protection."

La France of this evening states that arrangements have been made for sending reinforcements to Rome, if circumstances should require it.

REVIEWS.

Thackerayism.*



HACKERAYISM and Kingsleyism are two of the great classes into which the teaching of modern fiction may be roughly divided. What Kingsleyism is we have recently seen. And if the line which Mr. Thackeray has marked out for himself, and which a host of his imitators are content to follow, be not so distinct, and the "doctrine" which he preaches not so effective as that of his rival, the failure arises from no mere want of skill. As an artist Mr. Thackeray is unrivalled. His style, though it may lack the brilliant fervour, poetry, and enthusiasm of *Westward Ho*, or *Two Years Ago*, is perhaps as mere composition purer than Mr. Kingsley's. Its weakness lies in its want of

* 1. *Philip on his Way through the World*. 3 vols. Smith and Elder, 1862. By W. M. Thackeray, &c. &c.

2. *Pendennis*. 2 vols. By W. M. Thackeray. 1859.

3. *Collected Novels and Tales of W. M. Thackeray*, Author of *Esmond*, &c. &c. 1860.

heart. Not that the author is intentionally insincere either in word or thought; but he never throws himself heart and soul into the characters which he creates. In his hands they are mere puppets, the strings of which he pulls for the reader's amusement. He lays bare all their little weaknesses, follies, and frailties, as calmly and with as steady a hand as if he were dissecting a log of wood. This he accomplishes with inimitable dexterity, and at times with a sort of malicious satisfaction which will ooze out into the written words. We feel as we read that his eyesight is painfully acute; and should tremble to be his friend or even relative, for fear of appearing in his next microscopic photograph. He reminds us of the man who "had a good eye for dirt." We are convinced that if he once had us within range he would instantly detect and pounce on a sore place. This is not a pleasant impression, but it rises broadly from the whole tone and drift of his novels; and we feel that the vision which is so keen is also diseased. "The vulture hath its uses, but so hath the honey-bee." The error of Mr. Kingsley's books arose from one truth being so far overstrained as to become practically untrue; in Mr. Thackeray's the field of vision is so narrow and so partial that the whole aspect of things is distorted and unhealthy.

The text upon which he preaches is "All is vanity," *all*, without any exception; and the doctrine he draws from it is that the world more or less is one entire *sham*; that money is on the whole stronger than love; that respectability is the only virtue that pays, and even *that* is only regarded because it does pay; that all men are hypocrites, if not liars; that rank, money, station, and power, as well as most of the gifts of God, or man, are despicable, and make their possessors more mean and unworthy than they would otherwise have been; and above all, that *all* men (especially women, as an Irishman would say) are supremely and eminently selfish. In some of his stories, as, for example, *PENNENNIS*, almost every character is intent and only intent on making the most of *Number One*; to this one point devoting all their words, thoughts, and lives, every emotion, every power, every passion. The whole world presents to him, with but the rarest and faintest exception, one hapless spectacle of deception and hypocrisy; where the villain indeed is not a painted hero nor an exemplary penitent, but always succeeds to a certain extent, though he will at last come to grief, especially if he be found out; where the good man is eminently dull, and safe to be imposed on; where a skeleton is to be found in every man's cupboard; and in the great struggle between virtue and vice, virtue is *nowhere*. He reminds us of that old and bitter couplet,—

"The hapless mortals of this lower sphere
He withers up in one gigantic sneer."

So deeply is he impressed with the falseness of everybody, and everything under the sun, that all is veneered, and varnished for effect,—

"And life itself but one almighty sham,"

that we hardly know when he is in earnest and when he means to be in sport; when merely ironical, and when simply sincere.

In Mr. Kingsley's stories, as we have recently shown, the villain of the play, the profligate, or the blackguard generally turns out to be the hero, and the genius; but in Mr. Thackeray's, rogues usually come to grief of some kind,—though on the whole they prosper, because all are more or less roguish. According to him, life is more or less a huge, troubled game at whist, where, to make your way at all, you must be prepared to meet with a sharper at whatever table you sit down; and if you do not cheat him, he will certainly cheat you. Hence it is that the author never seems to have an idea of respect for his characters; far less can he love any one of them. And this temper not only mars the story as a mere composition, but destroys its truthfulness. If the world were made up only of sleek respectability, hypocrites, shams, impostors, and rogues, we should all go mad in a week. Mr. Thackeray's occupation would be gone for ever. Every man would be intent on his own cap and bells. If there

were indeed a skeleton in *every* cupboard, and a sore place of corruption in every good deed, good word, and thought of every human being under the sun; no innocent joy, no pure pleasure, no unselfishness, no genuine sunshine, and no truth; nobody to be trusted, and nobody willing to trust,—this world would not simply be Bedlam, but Pandemonium itself. Yet such is the picture our author draws; and this we assert to be unreal and untrue to life. No doubt, the picture, sad as it may be, is very amusing. The insatiable, craving thirst of the age is for amusement, and this he always offers in abundance. He deals minutely with the social habits and outer characteristics of men and women; he has studied them with calm and intense care; but he never gets at their inner heart. He makes you laugh, just when and as he likes,—at anybody or anything he will. If it were not so ghastly, life would be altogether an exceedingly good joke; every one is trying, in some way or other, for some little or great end, to *do* some one else. Just take a peep inside that *mauve* mantilla sweeping down Regent-street,—she looks happy, and so amiable, so innocent. She never knew what happiness was; she has just come out of Mr. Honeyset's fashionable chapel, and is at this moment inventing a new morsel of scandal that shall ruin Lady Godiva's reputation in two days; yet she gave 5*l.* to the Blanket Society for Poor Negroes. Her husband is a banker, serene, affable, and well-to-do; his reputation unblemished on the Stock Exchange, his piety undoubted in the Vestry;—ask him what has become of the title-deeds of the Springdale estates,—he will turn pale as ashes, and collapse. Look at that ragged urchin who sweeps the crossing, imploring old Major Pennennis for the love of Heaven to give him a penny for "a poor sick mother and her five children;"—that little villain never had a mother, and is even now picking the Major's pocket as he blesses him for the penny. As for the Major, the less we say about him the better. If we attempt to touch him, he will fall to pieces bodily, spiritually, and mentally; his boots are exquisitely varnished, but his feet are one incrustation of corns; his words are smoother than oil to old Lady Ararat,—you should have heard what they were like an hour ago to his valet, or last night to that poor pale-faced girl who pleaded with him for a little mercy. His very coat is not paid for, and never will be. But, are *tailors* to be paid? Surely not *this* tailor; he is a bloated spider who fattens on the wages of iniquity; he lives on the piteous life-blood of poor, starving needlewomen, and their starving children. His pines at Norwood are not to be equalled; he is churchwarden of his parish, and a highly respectable man. The parish is a model parish; soup-kitchens, schools, reformatories, mechanics' institute, a new church, and a model vicar; neither high, nor low, nor broad in his opinions. But, unfortunately, the church is not yet paid for, or likely to be; the appointment of architect was a job, Thompson was the vicar's wife's brother, and Jones, the builder, her cousin,—and no one knew that Thompson had never drawn a church before, or that Jones was going through the Insolvent Court; and between you and me, "it's nothing but stucco;" and, somehow or other, 757*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.* disappeared out of the cash-box in the vestry, and has never turned up since, though the vicar keeps the key. The school *looks* well; but the master is far too intimate with Miss Perriwinkle in Church Lane, for a married man,—it is said she is going abroad for her health. The reformatory prospers,—as well, that is, as anything can prosper that is over head-and-ears in debt, with an utterly incompetent manager,—who, it is said, knows what a ticket-of-leave is from personal experience. In short, look up Regent Street, or down, over the Surrey-hills to Norwood, or across the Park to the mansions of Dives and the slums of Lazarus, and all is barren.

Such is the picture of life presented to us in the pages of this brilliant novelist, with a mixture of sad irony, and keen sarcastic grace, with wit and a most charming style; that have been rarely equalled. Such a picture is neither true nor fair; and the doctrine of it is essentially false and

mischievous. It is founded on the idea that the work which God has given every man to do cannot be done ; and that the position which every man, woman, and child holds is the wrong one. Man is far too wayward, too wilful, and too feeble to do this work ; he is the creature of circumstances which he cannot control, and the sport of temptations which are too many and too strong for him. There is no help for him under the sun ; he must make the best of it. "Is a man very wrong for being after all only a man ?" says Mr. Pendennis. Well, we are inclined to think he is, and on authority not to be disputed. Warrington might have told Pendennis that "the man who sets out to be only a man" will end by becoming something far inferior to an animal. He will soon cease to mould the circumstances which hem him in, and to resist the temptations which beset him, which he was meant and made to conquer ; instead of the path given to him where his special work lies, he will chalk out for himself a path in which waywardness and wilfulness will usurp the place of conscience, and his spirit will have no life because his true work is being left undone.

But no such doctrine as this is preached by Warrington, or by any other voice of the author, for the plain reason that it forms no part of his own belief. Not one high-minded man, of noble aim, of fervour and of genius appears in all these books, to accomplish one great or good thing for the sake of truth or goodness. The religion of the few who profess to be religious in any true sense is one of mere sentiment, feelings, and emotions. The Dobbins, the Amelias, the Colonels, the Lauras,—the few people, in fact, in whom we take any interest, and who show some faint notion of moral worth, are slow,—and as a Rugby boy once said, "awfully heavy." Mr. Thackeray paints their outer manner and sensations well enough, but of their *inner life* he knows,—or at least he tells us, nothing. We have enough and more than enough of the Costigans, the Crawleys, and Becky Sharps,—but of those whose lives should leaven the story, as the lives of good men and good women do leaven this sad world of ours,—we have but a few thin barren touches.

With all its inimitable cleverness, therefore, and with all its exceeding irony and humour, its skill and power, we must regard Mr. Thackeray's picture of life as untrue, and his doctrine narrow and unsound. There is a better wisdom and a wiser doctrine. We believe that the light of men *can* so shine before men that others may see their good works ; that all the round men are not in square holes, nor the square men in round ones ; that all human life is *not* one mass of corruption with a varnish of respectability on the outside ; but that some are still left who are "the salt of the earth" which is not rotting to decay, but ripening for a better harvest.

We would advise Mr. Thackeray to regard this aspect of the truth ; to look a little more closely into the glimpses of sunshine and beauty and goodness, moral and physical, which yet abound ; as well as into the unclean spots of darkness and disease. It is a great thing to play so infinite a variety of tunes on one string ; but the melody will be far sweeter and far nobler if it spring from all the strings, in full and flowing harmony. A tinge of sadness and disappointment runs through all his song. Let him take a wider view, a stronger draught of fresh air—it is to be found—walk more in the sunshine, and look upwards oftener and with more loving eyes,—Heaven is above us all—and his next story will be infinitely more healthy, more Christian, more true, and more lasting than any he has yet written.

M. Guizot.*



GUIZOT has always stood, to his own honour, among those few Frenchmen who have risen above the nonchalant ignorance of their countrymen to a contemplation of English civilization. The attitude, not to say the supremacy, to which England

* *Embassy to the Court of St. James in 1840.* By F. Guizot.

attained among the great powers of Europe at the commencement of the present century was surely of itself sufficient to make her polity a worthy object of attention, especially to that particular people whom M. Guizot represents. This country, moreover, has since the middle of the seventeenth century had a claim upon the esteem of the Continent which the most revolutionary of all the continental peoples ought at least to have recognized. She was the first to overthrow feudality ; the first to set the evil example of a king's murder, as the necessary preliminary to the aggrandisement of a popular leader. The *Tiers Etat*, too, might have recognized the growth of an antecedent and kindred institution in the development of our Commonalty and its House of Parliament. Toleration in religion might have gone for something from time to time with the masses of a nation which once abolished religion altogether. But the French have studiously turned their faces from the English cliffs, and have refused to study our social and political system, just as at this day they ignore our language, put our baths and sponges on one side, sneer at our outdoor exercises, and hesitate to believe in our beef, mutton, or beer. It is significant, therefore, of the superiority which the very small sect of *littérateurs* and philosophers in France have over the bulk of the French population, that their attention to us should be considered in them so curious and distinctive a study. For ourselves, we are naturally interested to hear what others think of us.

Our insular position does undoubtedly cut us off to an inconvenient extent from the contemplation of continental minds, and thus tends to the undue secretion and coagulation of that vanity which a constant application of criticism would carry away. We suffer in fact from a modified form of the *morbus Americanus*, the symptoms being in our case mitigated in a ratio proportionate to the difference of extent between the Atlantic and the narrow seas. Contiguity has enabled M. de Tocqueville to tell us of our mortality, and M. de Montalembert to cool our self-glorification with rational esteem. It has also brought M. Guizot among us more than once, with his love of intellectual chit-chat, and his power of analysis of individual character, to lay before us sketches of our social life, and portraits of our contemporary or half-contemporary statesmen, under the appearance and with the features which they severally wear in the sight of a well-wishing and intelligent foreigner. It is this descriptive element in M. Guizot's account of his embassy which we take to be the most valuable and instructive. To those who care to make the lives of the statesmen of their country their study, and who are apt to consider, as a valuable clue to proper appreciation of the political events of an important epoch, the personal characters of the men who figured in it, M. Guizot's narrative will be useful in the extreme. The intellectual and moral value of Lord Holland, Lord John Russell, Lord Aberdeen, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Grey ; the influence which the little knot of speculative politicians, headed at that time by Dr. Arnold, Mr. Grote, and Mr. Hallam, had upon the different sections of office-filling or office-seeking statesmen ; the position and power of Daniel O'Connell in Parliament and out of it ; are all matters upon which M. Guizot, to his credit, brought his observation to bear : and the results of that observation are, as might be expected, by no means wanting in shrewdness and originality. With one remark that he makes we are, in common as we imagine with most of our readers, perfectly ready to concur. He notices the extreme exclusiveness of the great Whig families, and the hollowness of their pretensions to anything like true liberality of sentiment. Politically they are "liberal," if the extension of the franchise, and the virtual dereliction of the English Parliamentary system, be liberality. Socially they are exclusives of the very worst class, inasmuch as their affectation enables them to gain the ear of the nation. M. Guizot notices, for instance, how utterly unable Mr. Grote was, notwithstanding his consummate historical attainments, his political genius, and undoubted liberal principles, to obtain a share in the movement and direction of the great party of which he was an

ornament. He was at liberty to sit in Parliament and to speak and vote as an adherent; leadership he could not hope to share. As the Whigs of Pitt's day excluded Burke and Sheridan, so Lord Holland and Lord Melbourne kept out such *novi homines* as Grote and Hallam. Subordinate offices and dinners at Holland House were in plenty for them, if they chose to take them; but Grenvilles, Foxes, Russells, and the bearers of such-like names, only could aspire to be Premiers of Cabinets or Secretaries of State.

The lovers of intrigue however, and the connoisseurs in diplomacy, those who think that the power of cajoling and overreaching other men is the primary element of statesmanship, will read this volume of M. Guizot's autobiographical recollections with more *gusto* where it relates the story of the long game of fence played between himself and Lord Palmerston. Their satisfaction will be the more serene inasmuch as, by the showing even of his adversary, the Englishman had so completely the best of the game. The *naïveté* with which the "vexed" ambassador tells of his mornings of hard useless fight, and his afternoons of discomfiture and surprise, of the impregnability of Lord Palmerston's guard, of his reserve, his obstinacy, his secretiveness, and his collateral negotiations with Russia, Austria, and Turkey, to the exclusion of France, is beyond measure entertaining. Poor M. Guizot, he had the misfortune to be sent over to cross swords with a man who had long been master of the weapons which he himself was only learning how to use, and his defeat was a foregone conclusion. Luckily for him his countrymen were too indignant at their own exclusion from the Treaty of Four to remember his liability to censure. They ousted indeed the Government that had employed him, but they threw the reins of power into his hands. He returned to the Premiership of France; and now after the lapse of years, and a renewed change of fortune, he has come once more to England, to tell the English, with a good-humoured laugh, how prettily they outwitted him in the old days.

Hawaii.*

 HERE are probably a great many people who will not, at first sight, recognize the familiar *Owhyhee* of Captain Cook's *Voyages* under its modern orthography of Hawaii. When they make the discovery it will be with something of the pleasure with which one recognizes, under an unfamiliar title, some school-friend who has suddenly become famous in the world. For Hawaii has suddenly been made famous by the mission which the Church of England is sending out there under very interesting and remarkable circumstances. When we have stumbled upon such a recognition, we are curious to learn the intervening history of one's friend, what he has been doing, how he became famous. And in the case of our old school-friend Owhyhee, Mr. Manley Hopkins' book comes very opportunely to tell us all about it.

The reader will not, however, get far into the book before he will find that the subject is one of much more than mere accidental and passing interest: he will find, too, that it is handled with more than usual vigour and freshness; and he will settle himself down to the careful perusal of a very valuable history remarkably well written.

In the first place, the islands are of high scientific interest; for they are not only the result, but also still the seat, of a remarkably active volcanic agency. This is shown not only by the existence of the largest active volcanic crater known, but by other phenomena—earthquakes, unnatural movements of the sea, and the like results of the Plutonian forces. This crater of Kilanea is

by far the most terrific of the vents of the internal fire with which we are acquainted; and we commend it to the notice of the Alpine Club. We should like to quote the description of it; but we must limit ourselves to the mention of only one curious circumstance which is told us respecting it. The mirage of the desert, we all know, tantalizes the traveller with views of green plains, and lakes, and cities—and we have been accustomed to think these illusions the work of the imagination excited by fatigue, and heat, and thirst; but we here find the vapour of a volcanic crater producing the same kind of illusions upon comparatively calm and dispassionate observers:—

"As they gazed [across the crater] the illusion took an extraordinary form. They seemed to see before them an immense country stretching from the lava-plain at their feet, varied by hills and dales, upon whose slopes flocks of sheep were grazing, whilst cities and villages studded this land of faëry." (P. 21.)

When we come to the people we find them very different from our recollection of the savages who killed Captain Cook. They are described as an interesting race, of fine and handsome *physique*, intelligent, more energetic than the rest of the Pacific islanders whom we have met with, and showing a peculiar aptitude for what we call European civilization, towards which they are advancing with rapid steps. What makes their history particularly attractive is that we have in it the whole history of the rise of a people from an heroic age of true Homeric type to a civilization of the latest European model accurately described by competent cotemporary observers, and occurring within so short a space of time, and with such marked characteristics, as to give a dramatic interest to the story. The phenomena which the history presents are well worthy of the study of the votaries of the new science of Sociology. What Julius Cæsar is to the history of Britain Captain Cook is to that of the Sandwich Islands; each gives us a glimpse into the barbarous prehistoric period of the race with which he came in contact. But while the history of Britain extends through nineteen centuries, the Hawaiian history is all comprised within eighty years. From the day when the naked savages killed Cook with their clubs and spears, down to the reign of the present king—who is described as an English gentleman in education and habits, a constitutional monarch on the English model, and whose government, we are told, will bear comparison with those of the best governed states of Europe—all is included between the year 1778 and this present year 1862. We do not wish to stretch the comparison between the two histories further. But there are two incidents which present so curious a parallel that we cannot resist calling attention to them. Our readers will easily call to mind the incident in Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton's historical tale of *Harold*, in which the Saxon earl suffers ten of Norman William's doughtiest archers to aim their shafts at his mailless body, while he defends himself successfully with only shield and axe. In the history of the warrior king Kaméhaméha we are told that he would allow six of his best warriors to fling their spears at him, while he parried their blows with his spear alone. The other coincidence will be better reserved until we come to speak of the religious history of the Hawaiians.

This Kaméhaméha was not a mere Achilles—he was an Agamemnon too; he had the military talents of a general and the capacities of a statesman. He subdued all the islands under one sovereignty, and gave the first strong impulse to that love of commerce and of civilization which has since been so remarkably developed. The geographical position of these islands has favoured this development, and holds out to the energetic race which inhabits them the prospect of a commercial and political future of considerable importance. A glance at the map will show that they occupy a central position in the North Pacific. On the west lie the old empires of Japan and China, which are now being so remarkably opened up to intercourse with the rest of the world. On the south are the islands of the Indian Archipelago, Australia, and New Zealand. Eastward are the new states of British Columbia and California. The Sandwich Islands are already used as a half-way house

* *Hawaii. The Past, Present, and Future of its Island-Kingdom. An Historical Account of the Sandwich Islands (Polynesia).* By Manley Hopkins, Hawaiian Consul-General, &c.; with a Preface by the Bishop of Oxford. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts. 1862.

by the vessels which carry on the traffic between these countries. Should the islanders do no more than continue to fulfil this lowly function, their prosperity and importance must increase as commerce grows up among these opening old states and these rising new ones; but such a race, aided as it is by a large infusion of European capital and enterprise, will not be content to see these streams of commerce flowing past without trying to secure a share to themselves; and should the long-talked-of ship-canal across the Isthmus of Panama ever be accomplished, this group will then lie on the very track of the new lines which commerce will take, and may avail itself of its position in the midst of the watery desert to make itself the Palmyra of a larger commerce than the Old World ever knew. Politically, then, it is well worth our while to cultivate the friendship for England which has been the traditional policy of the Hawaiian kings and chiefs from Kaméhaméha the First down to the present fourth bearer of the dynastic name.

The religious history of the people is the most remarkable part of the whole story. It was through his intercourse with the excellent Vancouver—an Englishman in spite of his name—that Kaméhaméha I. obtained his insight into the power and civilization of the great world beyond his rude island-empire; and perhaps it was in consequence of the suggestion of the great explorer that the king commissioned him, on his return to England, to procure that religious teachers should be sent to him from that country. Vancouver executed his commission faithfully, and urged it with his own influence. But just then Europe was in the throes of the first French Revolution. Mr. Pitt had other things to think of than the interest of the Sandwich Islands. The missionary zeal of England was then at a low ebb, and the cry of this man of Hawaii to come over and help them was neglected. Still the new ideas which Vancouver had introduced worked in the minds of these savages.

Kaméhaméha himself continued a zealous maintainer of the national idolatry to the last; but when he died and his son succeeded, the people took a step which is without precedent in the religious history of the world. The long expected teachers did not come to teach them the new religion, but they had learnt enough to convince them of the falsity of the old, and they took the remarkable step of throwing off their old national religion, and destroying the idol-worship of their fathers. It was in this revolution that an incident occurred which furnishes us with the second curious coincidence with English history to which we have alluded.

"The most remarkable and unlikely accessory to the movement was the High-priest Hewahewa. . . . He subsequently related the steps by which he and the king came to an understanding between themselves upon the subject that was working in both their minds. The danger in which a disclosure would place each of them, the uncertainty of the other's feelings, made it difficult to arrive at the intelligence desired. It was obtained at last during a happy conversation, in which coy questions were parried by coy answers, yet not denied; and at last their sentiments were fully made known to each other."

When the king at length gave the signal, and the people joyfully proceeded to overturn the idols and burn the temples, the high-priest was the first to apply a torch.

"'I knew,' he said, 'that the wooden-images of our deities, carved by our own hands, were incapable of supplying our wants; but I worshipped them because it was the custom of our fathers. My thoughts have always been that there is one only great God dwelling in the heavens.'"

The parallel with this story is that of Coifi, the Northumbrian high-priest, as related by Bede. "'I have long since been sensible,' he said, 'that there was nothing in that which we worshipped; because, the more diligently I sought after truth in that worship the less I found it. But now I freely confess that such truth evidently appears in this preaching [of Paulinus] as can confer on us the gifts of life, of salvation, and of eternal happiness. For which reason, I advise, O king, that we instantly abjure and set fire to those temples and altars which we have consecrated without reaping any benefit from them.' Whereupon Coifi girt a sword about him, took a spear in his hand,

mounted the king's stallion, all which it was contrary to their superstitions for a priest to do, and riding off to the neighbouring temple profaned it by casting his spear into it; and then bade those about him to destroy it and all its enclosures with fire."

It is not our purpose to give even the briefest sketch of the religious history. We can only spare a few words more for the circumstances under which the present mission is being sent out by the Queen and Church of England. The American Independents have been at work in the Sandwich Islands for about forty years; and having found the people absolutely without a religion, and expecting Christian teachers, they had little difficulty in leading the whole population to a nominal adoption of Christianity. The French Roman Catholics have also been at work for some twenty-five years, and latterly with great earnestness and considerable success. But still we are assured that the religion of the people is very superficial. "Independents and Romanists frankly avow the smallness of their success in producing a vital change." Under these circumstances the present king, Kaméhaméha IV, renewed once more, in 1860, the application to England for teachers. He himself wrote to Queen Victoria, and by his minister to the Primate of the English Church, stating that it was the earnest wish of himself and of many of his chiefs and of the most influential foreign residents to have a branch of the Church of England sent out and planted in his dominions. The Queen listened favourably to the request, and the Primate consented to consecrate a Bishop of Honolulu. Some temporary difficulty arose about the royal licence; but the difficulty was overcome; the Bishop of Honolulu was consecrated; and, about the time when this reaches the eye of its readers, the bishop will be setting forth with his staff of clergy on their interesting mission. On his arrival his first important official act will be to admit the young Prince of Hawaii into the Hawaiian Church by Baptism; the Queen of England standing, by her representative there, as one of the sponsors. The Queen has already sent out a handsome cup as her christening present, and an autograph letter giving evidence of the lively interest which she takes in the whole matter. The sending of this mission is an event of considerable importance in the history of our own Church. Of late years we have sent out some forty daughter Churches to our own colonists; and in the last case, that of British Columbia, we touched the height of wise Christian policy by sending out a complete branch of the Church at the very foundation of the colony. We have gone a step further still in sending out missionary bishops *in partibus infidelium* to Central Africa (alas, for Mackenzie!) and to Melanesia. And in this Hawaiian Mission we enter upon still another phase in the development of our Church, for it is the very first time in her history that she has sent out, at the request of a foreign sovereign, a branch of our English Church, to be transplanted into foreign soil. For the Hawaiian Church, although in full communion with the Church of England, will have the status of an independent National Church. If there is any truth in the confused and inaccurate story which the old writers tell us, our own Church of England may be traced back, through the elder of its two streams, to a similar request from a British prince to the Patriarch of what was then the chief seat of Western Christianity.

We trust that the mission will have great success, and that England will not let it languish for want of ample support.

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.*



HE subject of national finance is one that to most persons appears superlatively repulsive. The broad general result of all debates upon it as evidenced in the amount and the incidence of taxation is all that people concern themselves with;

* *Twenty Years of Financial Policy.* By Sir Stafford H. Northcote, Bart., M.P. Saunders, Otley, and Co.

and even that curiosity is now limited to the single question—what the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes to do in the matter of Income Tax. The unconcern with which the annual budget is thus commonly received by the bulk of the nation is, among other things, a sign of that prevailing want of interest in the affairs of the State, of which political thinkers are accustomed to complain, as compared with the eager patriotism and minute political knowledge of former times. In England it must be admitted that there is more of this active and intelligent interest taken in public affairs than in any other country, but even among us it falls far short of the mark which the wise citizen would propose. Finance is, in its very nature, a subject which to understand requires an amount of knowledge, and that too of a kind which few have the patience to acquire. The student of financial questions must possess a knowledge of party history, which, in the absence of authentic contemporary records, is not easy of attainment; he must further be in some measure acquainted with arid commercial details, and with the general nature of most branches of trade; while he must also have mastered the various theories which have been propounded relative to methods of taxation. However, though all this is demanded from one who aspires after anything like the formation of a broad and solid judgment upon financial matters, a much smaller stock of information will suffice to enable us to enter with interest and intelligence into financial controversies, and to understand the close and important connection which naturally subsists between those controversies and others of an apparently more momentous character. In obtaining this information the volume before us will be found of the greatest service. Sir Stafford Northcote claims no very exalted place for his work. Originally intending it to be no more than a table of budgets, with explanatory notes, the plan grew under his hands, and he was forced to throw the table, which should have been the text, into an appendix. We cannot but deplore the fact of which the Preface informs us, that the author could not find time to add two chapters, the insertion of which he had originally contemplated, and which would unquestionably have rendered the present work more than doubly valuable—one, namely, upon the system of public accounts, and the other upon the financial progress of some other countries during the last twenty years. We hope that Sir Stafford Northcote may find time in the present recess to fulfil this intention. The financial progress of other nations especially is a subject of which it is almost impossible for an ordinary reader to procure any connected account, and yet it is one which more than any other would enable us to appreciate the progress and position of our own. It is strange, considering the number of books that are annually written, rather for the sake of writing than because the author has any especial preference for the subject, that we can lay our hands upon no history or even sketch of foreign finance. Its right treatment would involve much labour, but this can scarcely be viewed as a serious or permanent obstacle.

Sir Stafford Northcote has not professed to enter into the large principles of political economy, whose elucidation would have been not irrelevant to the matter more immediately in hand, but would, in fact, have invested it with a much wider interest; but it would be unjust to quarrel with what the author has done, on account of what he has omitted to do. The useful task which he propounded to himself at the outset he has performed, and in a manner eminently satisfactory. He places facts in a clear and comprehensive light, and his comments upon them, if occasionally rather scanty, are on the whole long enough to make the figures and financial operations perfectly intelligible. If we are now and again impatient at what strikes us as an omission, as, for instance, at the way in which the repeal of the Corn-laws is passed over, we must, in justice to the author, remember the end which the writer had in view. As a manual of the various financial measures since 1841 his work, written as it is with care, knowledge, and extraordinary fairness, will be of the greatest advantage and utility.

In the twenty-one years which have elapsed since the resignation of Lord Melbourne and the second accession of Sir Robert Peel to the premiership, there have been two budgets of great and important pre-eminence, the one brought forward by Sir Robert Peel in 1842, and the other by Mr. Gladstone in 1853. The first was the inauguration of a financial policy, which the second was intended to supplement and complete, but which in reality it has reversed in its most essential principle. Sir Robert Peel came into office under circumstances similar financially to those which will meet Mr. Gladstone's successes. For four years there had been a deficiency, and one which was increasing. Sir Francis (then Mr.) Baring, the present member for Portsmouth, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, had, in 1840, endeavoured to raise the requisite revenue by an increase of duties. The result was again a deficiency, and in 1841 he laid before the House a proposal for a reduction of the duties, the reverse operation having failed. But the House of Commons had lost all confidence alike in him and in the sincerity of the ministry of which he was a member, and Sir Robert Peel was almost unanimously considered to be the only man who could extricate the finances from the pressing and intricate difficulties in which they were then involved. Sir Robert Peel entered upon office with a majority of ninety votes. What ultimately became of that majority we all know. The financial statement of 1842 was made by the prime minister himself, and it contained the momentous feature of a proposal for the imposition of the Income Tax, which had been rejected, in 1816, by the decisive majority of thirty-seven against ministers. This impost, which Peel himself had denounced as a scourge, was to be tried as an experiment; the minister thought five years would be an adequate time for the performance of this experiment: but, in order to meet any scruples which might exist on the part of those who thought this too long, he would only ask the consent of the House to its imposition for three years. That consent was given by a majority of 106, partly owing to a conviction in the minds of many members that this was the only means of restoring the public credit, and partly to certain party considerations, which in the passing and rejection of budgets are frequently quite as influential as those of a purely financial character. For, besides the restoration of a balance between income and expenditure, Sir Robert Peel had urged, as an additional argument for the imposition of the objectionable tax, that it would enable him to make remissions of taxes which weighed heavily upon certain branches of industry. The representatives of these interests were conciliated by this prospect of relief, and supported a measure which, under other circumstances, they would not have hesitated to reject. There never was a measure passed by the House of Commons whose ultimate effect was so little foreseen. The imposition of the Income Tax in 1842 was the means of revolutionizing the financial system of the country. To be abolished at the end of three or at most of five years, it has now lasted for twenty, and there is no prospect of its abolition for many years to come, if ever. Originally propounded as an instrument for the removal of a temporary financial difficulty, it has been employed as a substitute for indirect taxes which have been recklessly done away with; it has encouraged ministers in a bellicose foreign policy, and it has been the occasion of enormous political immorality. "It would be a curious and not an unprofitable subject of speculation," says Sir Stafford Northcote, "whether the tariff reforms of 1842, or anything approaching to them, could have been successfully carried through without the aid of the Income Tax." It would, perhaps, also be worth while to consider whether those reforms were worth the enormous price that we have been and are still paying for them. *Suave est de magno tollere acervo*; and it is not improbable that the recklessness with which the nation is now plunged into unimportant and unprofitable, but most expensive wars, may, in a great measure, be attributed to the knowledge on the part of the minister that he has an inexhaustible resource to his hand. Practically, it is of no use to de-

plore the direction which financial reform has taken since the great budget of 1842. Taxes that have been remitted cannot be reimposed. But a dispassionate and intelligent view of its past history may make us more vigilant in the future of financial reform, and may dispose us to pause before cutting off more sources of revenue, and so throwing all the burden of meeting the expenditure upon a tax which is confessedly more unjust in its operation, and has a worse influence, moral as well as fiscal, than any of those duties which it has enabled the Legislature to remove.

The financial history of the period between Sir Robert Peel's resignation in 1846 and the first Chancellorship of Mr. Gladstone in 1853 is one of mediocrity; but of mediocrity much preferable to the genius which has since presided over the Exchequer. The twofold policy introduced in 1842 was gently developed until 1853, when it was revived with increased power. The remission of duties and the increase of direct taxation have been the two great objects of Sir Robert Peel's ablest pupil. Mr. Gladstone's budget of 1853 was greatly eulogised at the time, but subsequent events have made it appear in rather a different light. The distrust with which the City is known to regard Mr. Gladstone as a financier is now beginning to be faintly understood even by his admirers and supporters. The great budget of 1853 had, as Mr. Disraeli said in his memorable speech of the 24th of February, 1860, four great features. The first was to reduce the interest paid to public creditors, by an attempted conversion of the Three per cent. Stock—a scheme which the Chancellor himself afterwards acknowledged to be an "abortion." The second was a proposition borrowed from Mr. Disraeli's own budget of 1852—the reduction of the Tea Duties to 1s. a pound. The third was the Succession Duty, one of the most extensive failures known in finance; for Mr. Gladstone anticipated that in 1860 the increase under this head would be about two millions, whereas it only produced 711,000*l.*, or a little more than a third. The fourth feature was the plan by which the Income Tax should be gradually extinguished until 1860, when it should be discontinued wholly. How far this engagement has been kept is sufficiently patent from an unpleasant document at this moment lying on our table. We must confess that to our opinion Sir Stafford Northcote's comment upon this budget is too much tinged by the enthusiasm with which it was greeted at the time of its proposal, but which the present condition of our finance by no means warrants. Mr. Disraeli's criticism of Gladstonian finance, in his speech of the 8th of April this year, is one which should have shown our author that the "greatness" of the 1853 budget consists rather in its pretensions than in their realization.

Sir Stafford Northcote, in concluding his work, takes a view of our present financial condition even more gloomy than that avowed by the Tory leader in the speech to which we have just referred. He professes a "sincere conviction that the financial condition of the country is such as to render it our duty to lay aside all private and personal prejudices, and to co-operate heartily in setting right that which is amiss." In what direction our endeavours must operate, and how we have arrived at such a condition, is tolerably easy of apprehension, if we remember that in 1851-2 the expenditure was estimated at 50,291,323*l.* and in 1861-2 was 72,086,485*l.*

The Astronomy of the Ancients.

IR GEORGE LEWIS commences his historical survey of "the Astronomy of the Ancients" with the accounts of Greek astronomy, because, "though often meagre and fragmentary," he considers they "afford in general a firm footing to the historian, and enable him to fix with confidence all the principal stages in its progress." And, as the first "firm footing" for his history, he begins with Homer:—

"The original idea of the earth, as we find it in the Homeric poems, and as it still continued to be entertained, after a lapse of five centuries, in the time of Herodotus, was that it was a circular plane, surmounted and bounded by the heaven, which was a solid vault, or hemisphere, with its concavity turned downwards." (P. 3.)

In the foot-note, however, to this passage we at once find ourselves upon debatable ground; for the epithets used by Homer for "the heaven" Sir George thinks must express its "solidity," though, he admits, Völcker understands they refer to its "imperishableness." We notice this difference of opinion as to the proper meaning of *χαλκίος*, *πολύχαλκος*, and *σιδήρεος* (*Il.* v. 504; xvii. 425; *Od.* iii. 2; xv. 328; xvii. 565), because of the analogous disputes as to the proper meaning of the Hebrew word *rakia* or *rakab*, translated "firmament" in Genesis i. 6, of our English Bible, or "expansion" as in the margin; but which Mr. Goodwin, in his *Essay on the Mosaic Cosmogony*, will have to mean something hard and solid, overlooking both the literal meaning of the Hebrew and even the usual signification of the English word, as well as the marginal reading altogether.*

But we must pass on. We are next furnished with "the ancient ideas on the subject of astronomy as described by Geminus, a scientific Greek writer;" who says that—

"Homer and nearly all the ancient poets conceive the earth to be a plane; they likewise suppose the ocean to encircle it, as a horizon; and the stars to rise from and set in the ocean. Hence they believed the Æthiopians, who dwelt in the remote east and west, to be scorched by the vicinity of the sun. This belief is consistent with the ancient conception of the world, but is irreconcilable with its real spherical form." (P. 5.)

Sir George then states that "even in the time of Aristotle, a century later than Herodotus, the error in question was not eradicated;" for "this philosopher, in his 'Meteorologics,' speaks of *geographers* still constructing maps in which the *inhabited world* was represented as circular in form." We have italicised the words "geographers" and "inhabited world;" as we believe Aristotle is not speaking of the sphericity of the earth at all,† but merely as to its geographical surface features, so far as the world was then known.

"He declares this notion to be inconsistent both with reason and with observation. The measures obtained by navigation and by land journeys, show (he says) that the distance from the Pillars of Hercules to India, compared with the distance from Æthiopia to the Lake Mæotis and Scythia, is more than 5 to 3." (P. 5.)

We pass over a good deal more, which appears to us to relate to the geographical notions of the Greeks rather than to their Astronomy.

To save space, we must give the next quotations as the passages occur, without attempting to notice particular points, or to make them quite connected:—

"Homer describes the sun as rising out of ocean, and ascending the heaven; again, as plunging into ocean, passing under the earth, and producing darkness. He likewise speaks of the stars as bathed in the waters of the ocean; and he distinguishes the Great Bear as the only constellation which never sinks into the ocean-stream. A fabulous reason for this immunity was devised by the mythologists: it was founded upon the metamorphosis of Callisto, and her transfer to the starry heaven, which was as ancient as the poems of Hesiod.

"Other nations, as was natural, entertained a similar belief with respect to the sun setting in the waters of the far west. The ancients

* From its Latin root and mere sound, the English word "firmament" naturally suggests the idea of something "firm" to the minds of critics who are not also scholars; but the Hebrew word means quite the opposite to anything firm or solid,—namely, that which is *slight*, *vain*, *empty*; and is, therefore, better translated *expansion*, as in the margin. We are surprised Mr. Goodwin should have overlooked this marginal reading, and rashly stated such a rendering of *rakia* to be only an afterthought of modern theologians. The word of reproach, *raca*, in the New Testament is cognate, and signifies an *empty*, or *slight*, or *vacant* person, perhaps nearly corresponding with "idiot" in English.

† This is borne out in another citation from Aristotle, in the latter part of Sir G. Lewis's book, where he is arguing in favour of the rotundity of the earth, and not speaking of the mere surface conformation of the then known world. Thus:—

"Aristotle, arguing that the form of the earth is spherical, explains upon this hypothesis the opinion of those who not only connect the country near the Pillars of Hercules with India, as well as the seas in those two quarters, but account for the presence of elephants both in Africa and India by the resemblance of the most remote extremes. The true explanation, according to Aristotle, is, that India is near the north-western coast of Africa, because the earth is a sphere." (P. 502.)

inform us that the Iberians supposed themselves to hear the hissing of the sea when the burning sun plunged into the western ocean. (P. 6.)

* * * * *

"The Greeks even conceived the sun in the personified form of a divine charioteer, who drove his fiery steeds over the steep of heaven, until he bathed them at evening in the western wave. (P. 7.)

* * * * *

"In the later classical mythology, Apollo, or Phœbus, had become the god of the sun, and Artemis, or Diana, the goddess of the moon; but this identification had not been made by Homer and the early poets.

"The infantine astronomy of the Greeks did not explain how the sun found his way from the west, after his daily course through the heaven, back to the east and the region of the dawn. The mythological account of this journey was that the sun was carried along the external ocean in a golden goblet fabricated for him by Vulcan; and that he reclined during the night upon this vessel, while he performed the navigation from his western goal back to his starting point in the east." (P. 8.)

We must refer to Sir George Lewis's work for other similar passages, in the first two sections of the first chapter; but those we have quoted give a sufficient specimen of what we have called "the puerilities" of the Greeks; which he himself styles their "infantine astronomy;" and which is really all that Sir George gives to the world as the first inklings of "the Astronomy of the Ancients!" For, although he afterwards (as we stated in our previous notice) treats nominally of the astronomy of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and Assyrians, he concludes that their observations must have been "rude," and "doubtless but irregularly and imperfectly recorded." And he adds:—

"We cannot, consistently with the capacity and tendencies of the Oriental mind, suppose that either of these nations ever rose to the conception of astronomy as a science; that they treated it with geometrical methods; or that they attempted to form a system of the universe founded upon an inductive, or even upon a speculative basis. The knowledge of geometry ascribed to the Egyptians seems merely to have grown out of their skill in land-measuring. All the extant evidence goes to prove that the scientific geometry of the Greeks was exclusively their own invention." (P. 278.)

Again he says:—

"The science of Egypt, like the wealth and power of Persia, was found by the Greeks to be a nullity, when it became the subject of certain knowledge and observation, and they were admitted behind the scenes. *Minuit præsentia jamam.* The Alexandrine astronomers discovered the barrenness of the scientific land of Egypt, as the Ten Thousand Greeks discovered the feebleness of the great king." (P. 288.)

Let us, then, contrast the astronomical notions of the Greeks,—who are thus put forward as the true "ancients" by the most critical of living authors,—with the allusions we find in Scripture to the earth and heavenly bodies. Why Sir George Lewis ignores these ancient records he does not say; and in referring to them now we must be understood as merely citing them, as we might "any other book" of equally undoubted antiquity. Even if (with Mr. Rorison) we treat the book of Genesis only as "poetry," we shall yet be constrained to contrast its sense and soberness—we might say its "science"—with the infantine verses of Homer and Hesiod.—"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: He made the stars also. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day, and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good."

We might also contrast the account of the flood in Genesis (chap. vi. 17, and vii. 11-24) with the accounts of the traditional floods in heathen writers; and, indeed, if men will ask the Bible to be regarded "like any other book," we think they will only set themselves an everlasting puzzle, to account for its being so utterly *unlike* "any other book" they can name. Upon what hypothesis can men who despise "the capacity of the Oriental mind" account for the rationality of the Scriptures throughout—even if they regard them but as "poetry"—compared with the "infantine" notions of the ancient Greeks and Romans, as exhibited in their poets? But in the term "Oriental" he is surely no very deep philosopher who will think only of Egyptians, Babylonians, and Assyrians, and ignore the ancient records, in which the Second Com-

mandment and continual denunciations against idolatry and superstition are written. But we must pass from the consideration of the pure Theism of the Scriptures to consider once more its astronomical and cosmical allusions. In Job, chap. ix. 5-11, we have this sublime passage as to the power of One, Almighty, Invisible God:—"Which removeth the mountains, and they know not; which overturneth them in His anger; which shaketh the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble; which commandeth the sun, and it riseth not, and scaleth up the stars; which alone spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea. Which maketh Arcturus, Orion, and Pleiades, and the chambers of the south; which doeth great things past finding out; yea, and wonders without number. Lo, He goeth by me, and I see Him not: He passeth on also, but I perceive Him not." This is "poetry" no doubt; but its allusions to the earth, and heavens, and stars, are very different from those puerile ideas quoted from the poetry of the less ancient Greeks! Remembering the mention of Arcturus, Orion, and the Pleiades, in verse 9, we certainly read with amazement, in a work by Sir George Lewis, that "no reasonable doubt can exist that the constellations thus designated by Homer [the Pleiades, the Hyades, Orion, Boötes, and the Great Bear] were the same as those known by the same names in later times" (p. 58)—omitting all allusion to their being known by equivalent names in more ancient times. He also afterwards says:—"The Great Bear was most probably the only portion of the arctic sky which, in Homer's time, had been reduced into the form of a constellation!" (P. 59.)

But, considering how some recent "Essayists" have read the "poetry" of Scripture, we feel we had better quote the 32nd verse of chap. xxxvi. as elucidating verse 7 of chap. ix. to prevent rash misunderstanding:—"With clouds He covereth the light; and commandeth it not to shine by the cloud that cometh betwixt."

We now come to the sublime language in chap. xxxvii. and xxxviii. from which, however, we can quote but briefly:—"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. . . . Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth? declare if thou knowest it all. . . . Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion? Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons? Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven? Canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?"

Instead, then, of the earth being spoken of as a level plain, with visibly defined bounds marked by the vault of heaven, and the sun as sinking literally in the western ocean, as in Homer, (to say nothing of the sun and moon being conceived as "celestial beings" driving their chariots across the vault of heaven,) and such like,—we are asked in Scripture, "Hast thou perceived the breadth of the earth?" And in chap. xxvi. ver. 7, we have the explanatory and remarkable passage, "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Here we have a revelation of "ancient astronomy" that simply and utterly upsets all Sir George Lewis's subtle reasoning, that this idea was only reached in after-ages by the intellectual efforts of the Greeks, and subsequent even to the time of Thales,—for (he says) "it is apparent that the doctrine of the sphericity of the earth is *erroneously* ascribed to Thales" (p. 82), and he makes out that Anaximander (the disciple of Thales) held the earth to be a "cylinder," though he taught that it was "freely suspended in space." Even this, however, is only 600 years B.C., and can scarcely be referred to as "the astronomy of the ancients," till the book of Job is proved to be less ancient than it is universally esteemed, or till the relics of ancient Egypt have perished.

We must notice here what Sir G. Lewis says as to what he calls "the mystical erudition bestowed upon the origin of the signs of the zodiac." He thinks that Le-

* Such a heathen and idolatrous notion is probably glanced at and repudiated by the Patriarch as a superstition, in Job xxxi. 26—28.

tronne has "melted a huge frostwork edifice of fanciful conjectures, by determining the date of the zodiac of Tentyra to be the reign of Nero" (p. 289); and, strange to say, though his book is mainly written to discredit the imagined discoveries of the "Egyptologists," he claims their "incredible" reasoning as on his side, in alleging "that this and the other zodiacal monuments of Egypt afford no proof of the early cultivation of astronomical science in that country!" (p. 290). Now, it will not do for a critical writer to be sceptical and credulous in turn, as it may suit his argument. Why is Sir George Lewis thus content to swear by Letronne? There is actually an Egyptian coffin in the British Museum on which may be seen the twelve signs of the zodiac, and their resemblance to those of the Dendera planisphere. The exact position of the planets is also delineated on this coffin, and the date to which they point is the autumnal equinox of the year 1722 B. C., or nearly 4000 years ago.* Here is a fact that no theory of Letronne can upset, and no false deduction, or ignorance of Egyptian astronomy on the part of "Egyptologists," affect one way or another. Apart even from the position of the planets upon this coffin, there are the constellations, like those of the Dendera zodiac and very like what they even now are. Was the coffin manufactured in the reign of Nero?

But to return to "the astronomy of the ancients" as found in the Jewish Scriptures. In the Psalms we have the earth alluded to as "founded upon her bases" (marginal reading), or as in the Vulgate, "upon its own stability," from which it "shall not be moved" (Ps. civ. 5), till again God speaks the word, and "the earth shall melt away." And here we are obliged to notice the childish literalism in Mr. Goodwin's *Essay*, by which he will have it that the earth's being at perfect rest is signified by the words "cannot, or shall not, be moved." He overlooks other passages in which the earth is said "to be moved," or "may be moved" (Ps. xcix. 1), and others, in which the inhabited or moral world and the immovable reign of God's righteousness are rather referred to, and not the physical world at all, as for instance, in Ps. xcvi. 10:†—"Say among the heathen that the Lord reigneth: the world also shall be established that it shall not be moved: He shall judge the people righteously." And again in Ps. lxxv. 4:—"The earth is weak, and all the inhabitants thereof: I bear up the pillars of it."—Can Mr. Goodwin here, possibly, dream of literal "pillars," as he has done elsewhere?

We must now close this notice of a most important work, by an author of the highest reputation; but which certainly cannot be considered as a complete *Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients*, since (as we have shown) it takes no account of the astronomical allusions in the most ancient writings in the world, and does not deal critically with the astronomy of the Egyptians and other nations more ancient, at least, than the Greeks, whom indeed they regarded and spoke of always as "children."—"The hanging of the earth upon nothing," poised "upon its own stability," and that "the north hangs over the empty place," are all ideas far in advance of what Sir George Lewis finds in the early Greek literature. To account for their being found in Job and in the Psalms, but not in Greece, and perhaps (as he thinks) not even among the Egyptians when Thales visited them, would take us back into a deeper study than we can here enter upon. How deep we have already hinted in our previous notice; and certainly we think we have proved that this history of astronomy does not really rest on the "firm footing" its author imagined, as unquestionably it does not upon the most ancient foundations.

* *Vide The Times Newspaper*, of December 31, 1859.

† Compare Ps. lxxxix. 11; xciii. 1; xcvi. 10; xcvi. 1; xcix. 1; civ. 5. In Ps. xciii. 1, and xcix. 1, the word translated "moved" is more properly "stagger" or "nod." In the latter it is translated "unquiet," in the Prayer-book version—"be the earth never so unquiet," instead of "let the earth be moved;" and the stability spoken of in Ps. xciii., if it does refer to the physical earth (but in the original the word used is *tevel* not *aretz*), might be as well understood of the fixed law of the earth's motion and the stability of its rotation, if it moves, as of its being stationary.

As regards the real "Astronomy of the Ancients," (in the rigid sense of the word astronomy, and not as meaning any physical theories of the universe,) we would refer our readers to the work* quoted in the note to our previous notice; of which work the second and third parts have since been sent to us, and of which we have made free use in writing this *critique*. Although it is a remarkable fact, stated by Sir G. Lewis, that a heliocentric theory of astronomy was rejected by the two greatest mathematicians who ever lived, Euclid and Archimedes, as well as by Eudoxus, Hipparchus, and Aristotle, who all "deliberately preferred the geocentric solution of the phenomena" (p. 253); yet we are certainly somewhat surprised to find a writer in the present day referring to "Astronomy, as it has been developed by Copernicus and the moderns," as "a science of pure curiosity," "directed exclusively to the extension of knowledge in a field which human interests can never enter;" though, of course, we are quite aware that "human interests" and the world itself have gone on much the same, whether the earth has been believed, as it seems, to be quite at rest, or when there has been an esoteric doctrine that it is "driven about" (as Bacon used to say) "by a few car-drivers;" just as we find the sun gives out or withholds its heat much the same, whether our "philosophers" would have it to be quite cold and probably inhabited, as was the fashion a very few years ago; or, as some have more recently speculated in the most vague yet extravagant way, that "its heat is more than ten times, and less than 10,000 times, that of liquid water!" (we presume at the boiling point,) and would burn quite away, but that it is fed by meteors!† But when we "consider the heavens, the work of God's hands, the sun and the moon and the stars which He hath ordained," it is scarcely possible for man not to feel a "curiosity" as to *what they are*, as well as to exclaim, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him!" But we think this is a curiosity that elevates the creature; and that it bears closely upon "human interests," since it is upon such "sublime contemplations" that our relations to the Great Creator are most felt, and upon which true religion has ever been founded.

Sir George C. Lewis's *Survey of Astronomy* is a valuable record of authorities for those who would study, or hereafter write upon, the subject; but it is by no means so complete or exhaustive a Treatise as it has been too rashly pronounced by many reviewers. We have shown that it has not really gone back to the most ancient records, and also that its arguments are not always so logical as might have been expected from its distinguished compiler. "*Minuit præsentia famam!*"

Creation in Plan and in Progress.†



PROFESSOR CHALLIS'S *Essay* "was begun with the intention of answering the *Essay* entitled *Mosaic Cosmogony* in the volume of *Essays and Reviews*;" but the writer following "a leading idea, which is intended to be conveyed by the title *Creation in Plan and in Progress*," suddenly finds that he had materials for a book that "could no longer be regarded as merely a reply" to Mr. Goodwin's *Essay*, but an "Essay" itself, broaching a new theory of interpretation of Scripture. Professor Challis's book, however, is intended as an answer to Mr. Goodwin, though it assumes the form of a new "Theory of the Creation," which is supposed to follow from the nature of things, and also to be found in the Scriptures.

The theory is simply this, "that the creation, being a

* *Maxzarth; or, the Constellations*. London: Rivingtons, 1862.

† Compare *More Worlds than One*, written by Sir David Brewster against Dr. Whewell, and the Paper in *Macmillan's Magazine* for March, 1862, by Prof. Thompson.

‡ *Creation in Plan and in Progress: being an Essay on the First Chapter of Genesis*. By the Rev. James Challis, M.A., F.R.S., &c. &c. Macmillan and Co., Cambridge, 1861.

work, must have been, like every other work, *designed* as well as *created*;" and he maintains "that this twofold view of it is *in the Scriptures*." In saying this, however, he means that the Scriptures are sometimes merely speaking of the ideal or general design of what was to be created afterwards, when they would seem and have hitherto been supposed to speak of the actual work of creation. He thinks this would be seen and admitted, if we only had a proper "Science of Scripture," or "Scriptural Science," which he thinks is "at this time but little known." Professor Challis, having thus a theory of his own to establish, gives his mind to that rather than to answer Mr. Goodwin. Doubtless, were the theory established, all Mr. Goodwin's objections would be cleared away; but with it the obvious and ordinary sense of Genesis would also disappear. We cannot, however, say we find any good reason adduced for accepting the Professor's view as being anything like the truth; and we must profess our astonishment that he should have put forth, as a kind of new discovery, that there is such a thing as "Scriptural Science!" Surely he cannot but have heard of theology as "the Queen of Sciences;" and he cannot imagine that Christian theologians have hitherto failed to take the Word of God as the grand foundation and overruling authority in all their studies. We have read Professor Challis's "little book" twice over, as requested, but it has carried no conviction to our minds. When we read, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we still think we read of a creative act or work by which "things visible" first came into being at God's command; and in like manner, throughout the first chapter of Genesis, in every instance where it is written "and God said, Let there be," "and there was," we believe a new creative act or work was accomplished, simply as the words imply. We do not believe that mere designs, or schemes, or ideal exemplars, or principles, or qualities of things are spoken of, but the "things visible" themselves; and it is manifest to us, both from the Psalms and Prophets of the Old Testament and the words of Christ and His Apostles in the New, that there was no such "science of Scripture" then in vogue as would idealize in this manner the plain language of the first chapter of Genesis. We hope no such "science" will take root among us. We agree heartily with Mr. Goodwin, so far, that the words of Scripture must not be tampered with and explained away, but accepted in their plain and obviously real meaning. As regards the "days" of creation, we must account, as best we may, for what is revealed being or not being contrary to any facts of science which may be supposed to be ascertained. We do not in the least admit that any such contrariety has yet been proved. But to discuss this fully would be beyond the scope of this article. We think, notwithstanding, that Professor Challis writes in an excellent spirit and with the most laudable intention, though we think his theory has been hastily adopted; and though we cannot agree with him in his conclusions, but think his book as erroneous as that which it is intended to answer.

Some people make difficulties about discrepancies in Scripture. Perhaps one of the most common "discrepancies" talked of in our boyish days, was the apparent contradiction between verses four and five of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Proverbs of Solomon. In one sense, possibly, the Essayists are right, in demanding that "the Scriptures should be read and interpreted like any other book." We believe, moreover, that they have been actually subjected to a hypercriticism that the language of no other book could bear as the Scriptures have done. The texts we have referred to afford us an instance of this kind of foolish hypercriticism, and also supply us with a general principle for our guidance in dealing with such "folly" controversially. To take the words "*answer a fool according to his folly*," and "*answer not a fool according to his folly*," as containing contradictory directions, and leaving out of consideration the last four qualifying words of each sentence, is a specimen of a childish criticism, not only denoting the utter absence of "Scriptural science," but not even "interpreting Scripture like any

other book." This would be true even were there not the subsequent explanatory clauses in each verse, which give the reasons for answering a fool sometimes "according to his folly" and sometimes "not." We confess we think the *Essays and Reviews* have been very appropriately answered in many cases, simply, "according to their folly." The higher kind of answer intended in verse five has not so often or so successfully been given. It was right to meet the Essayists rigidly, in the first instance, in their own line. They professed to be rigid critics and scholars. They were met with better criticism and higher scholarship; and their blunders in reasoning and in Greek and Hebrew have been exposed.

Professor Challis, however, has scarcely even attempted to answer Mr. Goodwin's *Essay* in this way. The *Essay* is based upon extreme literalism of interpretation of the words of Scripture, and a hypercriticism of every expression made use of, according to the limited sense in which the words are understood or misunderstood by the Essayist. The answer given by Professor Challis is the propounding of a theory altogether new, and is not an answer at all, unless his new theory can be wholly accepted. We need not, therefore, be surprised if the Essayist continues settled in his former opinion and "wise in his own conceit," considering his *Essay* to be both unanswered and unanswerable, so far as Professor Challis is concerned. Unfortunately one of the other professed "replies" to Mr. Goodwin's *Essay*—that by Mr. Rorison—was also a mere theory, and one still wilder than Professor Challis's. Both these theories are not only contrary to the manifest intended meaning of the language in the first chapters of Genesis, as "plain statements of fact"—to adopt Mr. Goodwin's phrase; but must be regarded as expressly negated by the language of the Fourth Commandment, in which we have an inspired interpretation of the words in Genesis. We must not omit to say, however, that Mr. Goodwin has been answered by others. His hypercriticism and errors as regards, for instance, the meaning of the word "firmament," and other mere verbal difficulties, have been fully met, and indeed they had been both raised and answered long before Mr. Goodwin was born. But besides these, which ought never to have been advanced in our day, Mr. Goodwin's grand difficulties are founded upon a sceptical mode of reading all the statements of Scripture and an implicit and childlike faith—the critical faculty disappearing altogether. As regards the *quasi*-scientific theories of creation, which are based upon the nebular theory of astronomy and some facts and theories of geology, an able critic in the *Literary Churchman* is almost the only writer who has really joined issue with Mr. Goodwin on this ground, and exposed the vagueness, uncertainty, and contradiction of this patchwork of *quasi*-scientific truths—as to which even the "scientific" themselves are far from agreed in opinion—but which is accepted with all its faults and flimsiness by Mr. Goodwin, while advancing his childish and secondhand objections to the words and phrases of Scripture. If Scripture is to be interpreted like any other book, surely science and the common theories of men ought to be at least as freely criticised as the Scriptures. But the real fact is that prejudice, and bigotry, and blind faith, are as much manifested in poor human nature as regards the popular science of the day—esoteric as well as exoteric (as all history informs us, and as the great picture of *The Pillory* in the French gallery of the International Exhibition reminds us graphically)—as in religion, and perhaps rather more so. We can cite Professor Challis as a witness on this point. In page 119 he refers to his "having advanced a step beyond his contemporaries" in the discovery of a new truth by "mathematical reasoning;" but yet he is obliged to add, in a foot-note—even as regards mathematical truth:—

"I know enough of the history of physical science to be aware that an advance of this kind in an abstruse department of science can be expected to make its way only by slow degrees."

To enter, however, upon all the grave points raised by Professor Challis in the few pages which comprise the "conclusion" of his "little book" would require a volume

to do justice to the subjects, and is a task which we consider has scarcely been accomplished by the Professor. For instance, after he enunciates his "mathematical theory" just referred to, he becomes almost mystical, quotes the book of "Wisdom" (xi. 20), and adds :—

"Thus, after all, the indication of sense may be the foundation of knowledge. Who will pretend to say that *sound, harmony, light, and colour*, as perceived by the senses, are not eternal realities?" (p. 122.)

Here are startling metaphysics indeed! It is not only Scripture and religion in our day that are liable to be lightly attacked with strokes that reach to their very foundation! Professor Challis, indeed, remarks that his "views are directly opposed to those contained in Mr. Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*!" In truth, he might have added that they are contrary to much besides, hitherto almost unquestioned, as to the principles of human knowledge. And we fear we must observe, in conclusion, that Professor Challis cannot be satisfactorily answered on these deep points "in accordance with" his very brief reasoning, or verse 4 of the chapter of Proverbs referred to, but must be replied to as in verse 5, if answered at all, or "divine philosophy" will fare but poorly!

Correspondence of Napoleon I.*



It is now some years since the present Emperor of the French first set on foot the very remarkable publication of which the volume before us is a portion. He may, perhaps, have been in some degree led to it by the remark that was so commonly made in England, on the first appearance of the Wellington Despatches, that it was only a really great man who could afford thus to have not only all his actions, but all his thoughts, designs, and secret motives laid open to the world, and by the knowledge how greatly the revelation of those documents enhanced the reputation of his uncle's great antagonist, his only rival in military skill and renown. The present publication will have, we think, a similar effect on the fame of Napoleon I. In one respect he stood in greater need of such illustration than Wellington, since the pure glory of the British General was clouded by no such suspicions as envelope the conduct of the French Emperor; still less was it tarnished by undeniable crimes, by the offences against good faith, humanity, and religion, which inefaceably blacken more than one passage in the career of the French Emperor.

The present volume is one of especial interest, as relating to the first year of the Empire, and as, consequently, displaying to us the whole mind of the new Emperor at the first moment that he was able to look on himself as absolutely master of France, when he first felt that he had acquired a throne which he ventured to predict to his senate, in a reply to their address, contained in one of the earlier pages, "his descendants would long preserve" (p. 60). It is not from the coronation oath which follows that we should arrive at his idea of the Imperial functions. The volume before us shows that, in practice, he conceived the duty which he had imposed upon himself to exact from him a close personal superintendence of every department of the State. It is true that we find letters addressed to the Minister of the Interior, to the Minister of the Finance, to the Minister of the Police, &c. &c. But none of these persons had any real existence. They were merely clerks in their respective bureaux. He himself was his own Home Secretary, his own Board of Admiralty, his own Chief of Police; and while, in turning over this mass of correspondence, we are alternately lost in wonder at the prodigious energy, the multifarious and ready knowledge, the great and universal administrative ability which could continue to attend to such a variety of affairs, at the unparalleled union of political and military sagacity, of rapid decision

and patient investigation which it exhibits, we wonder not the less, and not without some difficulty in reconciling the jarring elements, at the glimpses of pettiness which these same documents reveal, and at the apparently incomprehensible condescension which led him from time to time to dwell, and that with undisguised anxiety, on trifles which, to ordinary observers, seem unworthy of the regard not only of a ruler of a nation, but of any man of ordinary largeness of mind and views. It is probable, however, that in so regarding many of the documents to which we allude, we may be forming an incorrect judgment not so much of the Emperor himself as of the singular people who invested him with that authority. At least we should not rashly conclude that he who, unassisted by a single extraneous circumstance, not having even the advantage of French blood in his veins, won his way to the supreme power by his own genius, and maintained himself in it till the foreign enemies whom his lawless aggressions had provoked proved too strong for him, had failed to understand the character of the people whom he could persuade to make the most wonderful efforts to repel those enemies and to preserve his authority. It would be fairer, and wiser, and more natural, to believe that he thoroughly comprehended their light-hearted, light-minded, impulsive disposition; that he appreciated to the full their acute genius, their brave, enthusiastic temper; and that at the same time he was equally alive to the almost equally marked littlenesses of their national character; their frivolity, their fickleness; their incapacity for receiving durable impressions; their preference for the showy over the solid, for theory over practice; and that to this correctness of his appreciation of the real character of those who had made themselves his subjects are owing many of the letters which strike an English reader as most inconsistent with the character of a sagacious statesman or a magnanimous ruler.

In this singular collection we find letters to almost every sovereign in the world; for Napoleon, owing his throne to a novel tenure, endeavoured from the first, (and even before he was entitled to speak of his throne) to set a new fashion of corresponding in person with the older and more legitimate monarchs. Accordingly, we have letters to the Emperors of Austria, and Russia, the Kings of Spain, England, Naples, and Prussia, the Shah of Persia, the Sultan of Turkey, and the Pope. The last being, perhaps, the most curious, from the coolness of the assumption with which, within six months of his coronation, the writer claims for himself the privileges of old hereditary sovereigns, and for his family all the rights, or privations, (we are hardly certain in which light princes in general regard such obligations) of royal houses. The object of the letter to the Pope is to induce him to annul a marriage which Jerome Buonaparte had contracted, after a short acquaintance, with a young Protestant lady of Baltimore. The new Emperor announces that he has, of his own authority, sent back "*Mdlle. Paterson, sa soi-disant femme*," to America, but requests a Bull "to efface all trace of this marriage," since, though he could make the Archbishop of Paris annul it, it is more proper that it should be annulled by the "immediate intervention of His Holiness, because the honour of a royal house is at stake" (p. 437). We need hardly add that the Pope easily consented to gratify the desire so expressed by a correspondent who signed himself, "His devout son, the Emperor of the French, and King of Italy." Napoleon's zeal for his royal house, however, was not allowed to interfere with his still greater zeal for the efficiency of the military and naval service. In a difference that took place between his brother Joseph and Soult, he entirely approves of the peremptory tone assumed by his marshal—"car mon sentiment est qu'il n'y a point de Princes à l'armée" (p. 497); and he is equally short and decisive in his repression of the extravagancies of Prince Jerome, who, like a Prince in another country, appears, when in command of a frigate, to have fancied that his relationship to the monarch exempted him from the duties of obedience to his superior officers (p. 529).

* *Correspondance de Napoleon Ier.* Publiée par l'ordre de l'Empereur Napoleon III. Tome dixième. Paris: Henri Plon J. Du-maine.

We have given Napoleon credit for understanding the character of his adopted nation better than we can do; and, looking at the correspondence in this point of view, that character is singularly illustrated by the attention which the writer condescends to bestow on the amusements of the Parisians. At p. 466 is a letter to Fouché, written before the bustle of his coronation at Milan was well over. The beginning of it refers to the conduct the writer desires to be observed with respect to newspapers; and it is worth remarking that, while as anxious as any of his successors to keep them under strict management, he yet avoids the rock on which they split. He would have his minister of police take care to provide them with editors of known attachment to his government, and of general good sense; but beyond that he would not interfere: "*je voudrais une organisation sans censure, car je ne veux pas être responsable de tout ce qu'ils peuvent dire.*" But he evidently thinks it of still greater importance what plays shall be performed at the theatre. He has read in the papers that a tragedy called Henry IV. is going to be acted. He disapproves; "that epoch is not so remote but that it must awaken passions." "Could not M. Fouché engage a playwright to write a tragedy on the passage of the crown from the first to the second race, so that a tyrant should be represented as succeeded by one who was the saviour of the nation?" He thinks that the oratorio of Saul may advantageously be performed;—"It is the case of a great man succeeding to a degenerate king." So he writes another letter solely to inquire what kind of opera Don Giovanni is; desiring to know Fouché's opinion "*sous le point de vue d'esprit public*" (p. 558). Certainly, it is only in France that such matters could be considered of consequence; nor do we think, sensitive as Mr. Seward is, that it has occurred to him to inquire what effect is produced by the comicalities of Lord Dundreary on the political feelings of the audiences, who, to Mr. Buckstone's delight and profit, throng to see our "American Cousin."

The most interesting portions of this correspondence to English readers will naturally be those which have the most immediate reference to his views and prospects affecting our own country. There is, of course, much that is unfriendly, much that is bitter, much that is (to our eyes) absurd, and founded on a (to us) incomprehensible ignorance of our national character. Yet, even in the letters which refer to England and the English are many traces of an enlightened and humane liberality. Even in the height of the former war the First Consul had sent a present of books to our Royal Society; and now, at the very moment when all Britain is resounding with execrations against the detainers of her unoffending citizens at Verdun, and when every moment that he can spare is devoted to organizing an invasion which, as he hopes, is to terminate her independent existence, he grants leave to an English gentleman, a Mr. Hamilton, to visit Paris to consult the oriental manuscripts in the Public Library (p. 141, date Feb. 7, 1805). In transactions like this, Napoleon shows to great advantage by the side of Cromwell, as he also does in his general treatment of his subjects. No massacres like that at Drogheda, no sales of Frenchmen for slaves, stain his memory; and though, like too many conquerors, he had but small regard for human suffering, but little value for human life, and was utterly unscrupulous in his adoption of any measures which he fancied likely to contribute ever so indirectly to the consolidation of his power: yet, among the darkest passages of his life glimpses of a better nature from time to time break forth, and prove him as superior in the qualities of the heart as he was in those of the mind to the English usurper, with whom, at one time, his own admirers thought it no dishonour to compare him.

As one would naturally expect, a great portion of the correspondence of so great a warrior turns upon the probabilities of the war; and it is curious to see, in the first place, what minutely accurate information he was able to obtain of our plans and of our resources for carrying them into execution: and, on the other hand, how completely he failed to ap-

preciate the resolution of our countrymen, the administrative capacity of Pitt and his colleagues, and, what proved the greatest obstacle of all to the success of his own plans, the genius and enterprise of Nelson. We find him more than once setting before Admiral Decrès, his Minister of Marine, not only the precise force of the different English squadrons which were blockading his ports, but even the condition of the ships which composed those squadrons; but Nelson's movements outstripped all his reckoning. He reproaches Decrès with "forming his calculations as if the English were in the secret" of his plans (p. 505). Yet events proved that the calculations of Decrès were well founded, for Nelson, though not in the secret, had divined his plans in their most important features, and at the very moment that Napoleon made sure that the British fleet "must have either returned to England or be still in the Mediterranean" was chasing Villeneuve from Gibraltar to the West Indies, and back from the West Indies to Europe; and by his audacious energy and penetrating genius dissipating all the schemes that had been formed with such infinite care, and brought to the very point of their accomplishment at such a lavish expenditure of money and labour. It seems strange, but the only thing which Napoleon was unable to understand was the working of a genius in its way as great and complete as his own, under the influence of a lofty patriotism and high motives, to which he could make no pretence. Napoleon had as great a horror of *but* as Cleopatra. Speaking of Admiral Missiessy, he says to Decrès, "He must be gone, if you sent him positive orders; if you said *if*, or *for*, or *but*, he is certainly not gone" (p. 451). Sometimes we come across a Roman sentiment. He is speaking of Bruix, Ganteaume, and Decrès, men whose actions were written in the brightest pages of the naval history of their country; and his language is, "They have, in my eyes, the very great merit of not having despaired of our marine" (p. 358.)

But in a brief and passing sketch like the present it is impossible for us to give anything like a fair notion of this correspondence. The utmost that we can hope to do is to direct to the work itself the attention of those among our readers who would form a just and impartial estimate of one of the most remarkable men that have ever lived. For a long time one party of politicians among us thought no praise high enough for him; for a still longer period a larger portion of the nation thought no language bad enough for him. Future ages may perhaps with greater justice pronounce him "o'er good for banning, and o'er bad for blessing, like Rob Roy." But no estimate will be borne out by the facts of his career that fails to recognize throughout it a most universal and lofty genius, displayed not only in war and in statesmanship, but in every scene in which man works on and by man; and to acknowledge that, while he displayed many admirable qualities which belonged to himself, his vices, and follies, and crimes are in a great degree attributable to the demoralised age from which his youth drew its first lessons and principles; his early manhood, its stimulus to action; his maturer years, their success, complete in everything but the alloy with which success so attained was perhaps inseparably connected, an ever-restless and oppressive sense of its incompleteness.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We cannot undertake to return communications.



ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Church and State Review" is published on the first of each month, price 1s., or free by post for one year for 14s., payable in advance.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.

A Page	£9 0 0
A Column	4 10 0
Five Lines	0 5 0
Every additional Line	0 1 0

Advertisements must reach the Office not later than the 24th of each Month.

OFFICE: 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

THE Church and State Review. Edited by ARCHDEACON DENISON. Price 1s.

CONTENTS OF No. 1.

Review of the Position.
The Question of Retrenchment.
The Church-rate Division.
The American War.
The Clergy Relief Bill. Non-intervention.
The Ebb-tide of Democracy.
"Liberalism" as a Creed. Joseph Wolff.
Rugby and Balliol.
The Position and Prospects of Convocation.
Judgment in Synod.
The Church in the Manufacturing Districts.
The Evidence of Infidelity.
Marriage Licence. The Re-revised Code.
The International Exhibition.

Modern Incredulity.
The Royal Supremacy.
Church and State in America.
Hymnology. Poverty of the Clergy.
Scotch Communion Office. Bigotry.
Convocation in Ireland.
The Life of William Pitt.
Biblical Psychology.
Mendelssohn's Letters.
Lord Auckland's Correspondence.
Mrs. Browning.
Dean Ramsay on the Christian Life.
Dr. Cumming. Miss Sewell on Rôles, &c.
Recent Fiction.

CONTENTS OF No. 2.

Earl Russell. The National Society.
The Whigs and the Church of England.
Mexico. Clergy Relief and Burial Bill.
The Ballot. Mr. Estcourt.
Earl Canning.
Our Want of Clergy. Modern Warfare.
Ultimate Appeal Court.
The Latitudinarian School.
Mission Houses. The Royal Academy.
The Bicentenary. Gipsies.

Innkeepers. The Way of Unity.
Dilapidations. Body Snatchers.
For Better for Worse. Summary of Events.
Carlyle's "Frederick the Great."
Miss Sewell on Rome, &c. Edward Irving.
The Church and the Churches.
Life amongst the Colliers.
Monastic Life. Secularia.
Psychological Inquiries.

CONTENTS OF No. 3.

Practical Politics.
Judgment in the Court of Arches.
The Session of 1862. Austria and Hungary.
The Oxford Congress. Prussia.
Committee of the National Society.
Editor's Note. Bishop Mackenzie.

Increase of the Episcopate.
Henley Regatta. Bishopric of Honolulu.
Summary.
Church Expansion, &c.
The Present Position of the Liberal Party.
Threefold Nature of Man.
The Astronomy of the Ancients.
Sisters of Mercy. Kingsleyism.
Thirty Years of Musical Recollections.
Schleiermacher.

Musical Development.
Architectural Development.
Windermere. The Influence of the Clergy.
Modelling. Rural Schools.

The CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW may be obtained at all the Railway Book-stalls, and of all Booksellers in Town and Country.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

Now ready, price 14s.

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.

BY SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, BART., M.P.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

A MARRIED CLERGYMAN, Ex-Scholar and Gold Medallist of Trinity College, Dublin, in Sole Charge of a small Parish in Kent, desires ONE or TWO resident PUPILS, between the ages of Ten and Fourteen years. For terms, references, &c., address Rev. R. R., Fawkham Rectory, Dartford, Kent.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced TUTORs, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M.A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

Exeter Theological College.

Visitor—The Lord Bishop of Exeter.

Council—The Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Principal—The Very Rev. C. J. Ellicott, B.D.

Vice-Principals—The Rev. R. C. Pascoe, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; and the Rev. T. W. Hardy, late Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The College is designed for Graduates of either of the Universities, who are desirous of obtaining instruction in Theology, and of presenting themselves as candidates for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Exeter or elsewhere. Fee 10l. each Term.

For further information, respecting time of residence and course of study, apply to the Very Rev. the Dean, Exeter.

The next Term will commence on Tuesday, September 30.

HAILEYBURY COLLEGE.—Head Master

—The Rev. ARTHUR GRAY BUTLER, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

Terms of Admission.

Pupils not nominated to pay—

Sons of Laymen, 65l. per annum.

Sons of Clergymen, 55l.

Pupils nominated to pay 10l. less in each case.

Donors of 100l. entitled to have always one pupil in the School. Donors of 26l. 5s. entitled to nominate one pupil.

The holidays will be at the same times of the year as at Eton and Harrow. The School will be opened on Thursday the 11th of September next.

All communications are to be addressed to the

Rev. LEWIS DREDES, Bramfield Rectory, Hertford, } Hon. Secs.
E. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Amwell, Ware,

S. Andrew's College, Chardstock, Dorset.

A PREPARATORY SCHOOL for the Sons of the Clergy and Laity of small means.

Principal—The Rev. Charles Woodcock, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, and Vicar of the Parish.

Head Master—The Rev. Francis Allen, B.A., Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by a competent staff of Masters.

Terms.—Entrance fee Two Guineas; board, washing, and education, Ten Guineas a quarter, paid in advance. This charge covers all expenses. Full particulars forwarded on application to the Principal.

ST. MARGARET'S COLLEGE, NORTH-END, London, S. W. (near the Kensington Station), for the Education of Young Ladies.

Principal—Rev. ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A.

Lady-Superintendent—Mrs. LENDRUM.

The education and discipline are conducted, under the direction and superintendence of the principal, by talented and accomplished Governesses, English and Foreign, assisted by eminent London Professors.

The buildings consist of a spacious Mansion, with grounds of considerable extent, and large and lofty rooms. Twenty of the senior pupils have separate sleeping apartments.

The next term will commence, after the Midsummer holidays, on Tuesday, the 23rd of September.

N.B.—No day pupils are received.

Prospectuses and particulars sent on application.

PRIVATE TUITION.—A Married Clergyman, late Fellow and Public Tutor, of University Honours, high testimonials, and great experience in education, has TWO VACANCIES among Three Pupils, who are prepared for the Universities or Army. Terms moderate.

Address the Rev. M. B., Mr. Andrews', Bookseller, Durham.

DUNDEE.—The BISHOP of BRECHIN wishes to hear of one or two LADIES who would be disposed to join, either temporarily or permanently, a small community engaged in working among the poor of Dundee. A small weekly payment would be required during the period of residence. For further particulars, apply by letter to the Right Rev. the Bishop of Brechin, Dundee.

BRIDGWATER GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Head Master—Rev. T. STANTIAL, M.A., Oxon. Author of the Student's Test Book.

The Head Master receives into his house a few young Gentlemen. An effort is made to combine home comforts and influence with the advantages of a high course of education. A Prospectus of Terms, &c., will be forwarded on application.

Bicentenary Volume.

THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE have just published a volume which contains all the public documents of importance, from "The Declaration of Breda" to "The Act of Toleration," that relate to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. The documents are collected from the most authentic sources; and being published without note or comment of any kind, they are left to tell their own unbiassed tale. This volume, 516 pp., demy 8vo., printed in a clear handsome type, may be had bound in embossed gilt-lettered cloth, price 4s. 6d., or stitched in paper covers, price 4s.

London: W. KENT AND CO., 23, Paternoster Row; and at the Office of the Committee, 10, Broad Street Buildings, E. C.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS at BULL'S LIBRARY.—Surplus Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices*. Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

2d. IN THE 1s. DISCOUNT ALLOWED on BOOKS and MAGAZINES purchased at 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

PARCELS OF 5l. VALUE (at this rate) sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

CLERGYMEN, BOOK SOCIETIES, and LARGE BUYERS, supplied on more advantageous terms.

MAGAZINES supplied regularly on the 1st of the Month.

ANY BOOK sent Carriage Free on receipt of the Published Price.

A CATALOGUE of Books for Lending Libraries, sent for one Stamp.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S SERMON and MANUSCRIPT PAPERS, Ruled and Unruled, are sold in packets of 5 quires, at 1s. 3d., 1s. 6d., 2s., and 2s. 6d. each.

SAMPLES sent POST FREE on application.

PAPER RULED to ANY PATTERN on reasonable terms.

SERMON CASES with Two Pockets, 1s. each, post free.
PARCELS OF 20s. WORTH sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10s.; single sample, 2s.

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

GARDNER'S 2l. 2s. DINNER SERVICES complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3s. 6d. per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7s. 6d. per pair. H. and J. GARDNER (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

KNICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15s. 6d.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25s.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.
H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

Exchanges and Advowsons.

WEST MIDLAND AND WEST OF ENGLAND CLERICAL REGISTRIES (United).

Conducted by a Clergyman,—a late P. C. in the Diocese.

Offices, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

(Originated April, 1862: 150 Members, Beneficed Clergy and others.)

The above will be found an organized medium by the Clergy in connection with Clerical Business of all kinds, without intervention of agents.

Prospectus on receipt of stamped envelope.

Curates supplied with Curacies, Holy Order Candidates with Titles.

Between 50 and 60 Exchanges offered to Members.

Subscription for the year, 5s. (stamps received) for Curates.

N.B. Advowsons and Presentations wanted immediately; Presentation to a living of 180l. net, for sale; Curacy can be held, and Interest allowed until vacancy.

Address:—The Reverend the Secretary, as above.

PREPARATION FOR HOLY ORDERS: BISHOPS' EXAMINATIONS.

THE Advertiser, a Clergyman (M.A. Oxon.) of experience and great success in preparing gentlemen for the above, residing at Malvern, Worcestershire, (a delightfully-situated place for Reading, with every facility), has Vacancies; (36 gentlemen have read and passed from the Advertiser). His last pupils were a Durham B.A. and a Student of Christ Church, Oxford, for Priesthood; and he has now two reading for the September and Christmas Ordination, M.A.'s of Oxford—Diaconate and Priesthood.

Prospectus of terms and particulars on application.

Letters to contain real names and addresses. Clerical References required. Lodgings easily procured.

High Clerical References and to Pupils in Orders.

The Advertiser procures for his Pupils fit and proper Titles.

Address:—Reverend P. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

SUNDAY DUTY taken by a CLERGYMAN at shortest notice; at half the usual fee, and simple travelling expenses. References.

Address:—Reverend S. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

* * A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

Vintage Wine Company.

IMPORTERS OF SPANISH WINES.

XERES COMIDA SHERRY,

Soft, Fine Body, Age, and Flavour.

"A marvel of purity and cheapness."—*See Press.*

Golden, 18s.; Pale, 20s. per dozen.

Samples for 1s. 6d.

Hampers of Two Dozen carriage paid to any Railway Station.

VINTAGE WINE COMPANY,

14, Bloomsbury Street, London.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices, for Cash only:—

The Complete Suit	52s.	63s.	and	85s.
Morning Coats	25s.	30s.	and	45s.
Trousers	16s. 6d.	21s.	and	26s. 6d.
Waistcoats	10s. 6d.	12s.	and	13s. 6d.
Frock and Overcoats	30s.	36s.	and	55s.

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors, next door to Somerset House, Strand.

GOVERNESSES' BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, with power to hold land by gift, purchase, or bequest.

Under the Patronage of Her Most Gracious Majesty.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge.

Her Royal Highness the Hereditary Grand Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary Adelaide.

President.—The Earl of Harrowby.

The objects of this Society are:—

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE to Governesses in distress, afforded privately through the Ladies' Committee.**ANNUITY FUND.**—Elective Annuities to aged Governesses secured on invested capital, and thus independent of the prosperity of the Institution.**PROVIDENT FUND.**—Provident Annuities purchased by ladies in any way connected with education, upon Government Security, agreeably to the Act of Parliament. This branch includes a Savings' Bank.**A HOME** for Governesses during the intervals between their engagements.**A SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION** entirely free of expense.**AN ASYLUM** for the Aged.*Auditors.*—Thomas Hunt, Esq.; Henry Kingscote, Esq.; Capt. the Hon. Francis Maude, R.N.*Treasurer.*—Benjamin Bond Cabbell, F.R.S., F.S.A.*Hon. Secretary.*—Mrs. D. Laing.*Bankers.*—Sir S. Scott and Co., 1, Cavendish Square, W.**CHARLES W. KLUGH, Secretary.**

No. 32, Sackville Street, W.

WINE for the HOLY COMMUNION.

After long and careful search for a PURE SACRAMENTAL WINE, a few casks of very choice and rich "St. Martin," Malaga, landed in 1839, have been secured as possessing every indispensable quality, and will be disposed of exclusively for this sacred use. Price 50s. per dozen, cash. Best Rota Tent, 42s. per dozen. Orders must be accompanied with a remittance. **GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, &c., London, E. C.; and Park Row, Greenwich, S. E.**

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3/. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free. Also, **ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE**. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY. Capital 100,000/. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

New ready, price 1s. 6d. each, post free.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC GALLERY. The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.

BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Moray and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickensteth, Mackenzie, Denison.

DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellicott, Jacobson, Sewell, Guthrie, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolf.

REVERENDS C. Kingsley, Vaughan, Bryan King, Hugh M'Neill, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upton Richards, W. Grealey, J. Mackonochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. P. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Geyt, J. M. Bellev, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE. An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W. C.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—ROYAL GERMAN SPA, Brighton. Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by **GEORGE WAUGH & CO.**, Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

Church-Rates.

THE COMMITTEE of LAYMEN, while they congratulate Churchmen on the renewed rejection of the Abolition Bill, frankly and earnestly call upon all friends of the Constitution to support them with the pecuniary means requisite to ensure similar success for the future. The Committee have hitherto not received a tenth of the annual revenue placed at the disposal of those whose projects they have had to watch and counteract.

It is requested that contributions may be addressed expressly to "The Committee of Laymen," at the banks of Messrs. Hoare, 37, Fleet Street; and Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birchin Lane, London; or to the Honorary Secretary, 16, Manchester Buildings, Westminster, S. W.

JOHN M. KNOTT, *Hon. Sec.*

June 30, 1862.

CHURCH and DECORATIVE EMBROIDERY. FOR EVERY PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH. Executed from the best and most practicable Designs and Examples of ANCIENT NEEDLEWORK. Ante-pendia, Chancel-carpet, Sermon-cases, Book-markers, &c. &c., prepared with every facility for Ladies own working.

By R. HELBRONNER, 265, Regent Street, (near the Circus, Oxford Street).

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Warehouses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that **RICHARD LOADER and Co.** have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E. C.

84,000/. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, **Mr. STEPHENS**, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE,

FOR SEPTEMBER 1862. No. DLXIII. PRICE 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

Watering-places.
Shiraz to Bushire.
Caxtoniana.—Part VIII.
No. 11.—On the Distinction between Active Thought and Reverie.
No. 12.—On the Spirit in which New Theories should be received.
Chronicles of Carlingford; Salem Chapel.—Part VIII.
President Jefferson Davis.
Pictures, British and Foreign; International Exhibition.
Trollope's North America.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS,
Edinburgh and London.

New Weekly Literary Paper.
The Literary Budget.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF LITERATURE,
THE DRAMA, SCIENCE,
AND ART.

Published every Saturday.

PRICE 3d., OR 4d. STAMPED.

CONTENTS FOR SATURDAY,
AUGUST 16, 1862.

Elizabeth and her Historians.
Modern Fine Style, Spasmodic and Sensational.
Two Modes of Study.
Dogberry in Print.

Biquette. De la Rive's Count Cavour.
The Spas of Europe. Essays by a Barrister.

French Correspondence.
"Politics, People, and the Press."
Periodicals and the Prize System.

The Close of the Season at Her Majesty's
Theatre. Medea at the Adelphi.

FINE ARTS.
Drawing Room Criticism.
The Prince Consort Memorial.

Two Types. Organic Remains Restored.
Mr. Bellew's Tour.
Citizens at Twickenham.
Water and Wine.
An Omnibus Conductor's Speculation.
Gossip, &c. &c.

CONTENTS FOR SATURDAY,
AUGUST 23, 1862.

Penny-a-Liners.
The Bishop of Exeter and the *Saturday Review*.
The Literature of the Supernatural.
Novelists and Lawyers.

Herzogovina.
The Public Life of Lord Macaulay.
Jefferson and American Democracy.
Decimal Coinage. Tour in Hungary.

French Correspondence.
Music, Scenery, and Stalls.
Morbid Gymnastics.

FINE ARTS.
A National Hall of Monuments as a Memorial
to the Prince Consort.
The French Critic and the English Sideboard.

Sensation Stories. Pictures and Poetry.
Advertising Money-Lenders.
A Good Frontage required.
Lord Shaftesbury and the Journalists.
Consanguinity.
Mr. Train in Curator Street.
Farina of Cologne. Gossip, &c. &c.

The LITERARY BUDGET may be had from Newsvenders in Town
and Country, and at all the Railway Book Stalls.

OFFICE: 7, Burleigh Street, Strand; London.

This Day is Published, Price Eighteen Pence .

Essays and Reviews.

AN EXAMINATION
OF SOME PORTIONS OF DR. LUSHINGTON'S JUDGMENT ON
THE ADMISSION OF THE ARTICLES IN THE CASES OF
THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY V. WILLIAMS
AND FENDALL V. WILSON.

With Remarks upon the Bearing of them with the Clergy.

By JOHN GROTE, B.D.

*Vicar of Tringington, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the
University of Cambridge.*

Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.
London: BELL AND DALDY.

Columbia Mission.

THE THIRD REPORT has just been published.

Price Sixpence.

RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place, London.

August, 1862.

**New & Important Works
Now Ready.**

The ASIAN EXPEDITION. Travels in Ladak,
Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic
illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel
TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers. 8vo. 28s.

The CIRCUMNAVIGATION of the GLOBE
by the AUSTRIAN FRIGATE *NOVARA*. English Edition.
Containing an Unpublished Letter from Baron Humboldt. With
numerous Wood Engravings. Dedicated by special permission
to Sir Roderick Murchison. 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. 30s.

**On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL
MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY.** By RICHARD OWEN,
F.R.S. 8vo. 6s.

**TWENTY YEARS of FINANCIAL PO-
LICY;** a Summary of the Chief Financial Measures passed
between 1842 and 1861; with a Table of Budgets. By Sir
STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. 14s.

**The CRUISE of the ST. GEORGE on the
WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION,**
during the Years 1861-1862. By N. B. DENNY, R.N. 8vo.
10s. 6d.

NORTHERN EUROPE: Denmark, Sweden,
Russia, in 1861; with Lectures on the Blue Mountains, the De-
cline and Fall of Mogul Empire in India, and Notes on Russia
in the East. By Captain W. F. B. LAURIE, H.M.'s Madras
Artillery. 8vo. 12s.

**The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENG-
LAND** from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By
the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow
and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II.
21s.

The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its
Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement
of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain, to the last Morocco War.
With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of
the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a
Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar.
Illustrated. 8vo. 18s.

New Work by the Author of "Miriam May," and "Crispin Ken."

**The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBE-
RAL" PARTY.** By the Author of "Miriam May," and
"Crispin Ken." 8vo. 15s.

"Those who have not forgotten the appearance of Sir E. B. Lytton's
'The Crisis,' of which the first edition was taken up in a day, will re-
member the furore that that remarkable political brochure created. The
publication at the time of 'The Present Position of the Liberal Party,' by
the Author of 'Miriam May,' and 'Crispin Ken,' has already shown that
the work is likely to be the town talk; and, even long before its appearance,
it has been the subject of conversation of all political circles."—*Pres.*

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.

66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

In post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

YONGES' P. VIRGILII MARONIS
BUCOLICA, GEORGICA ET ÆNEIS.

"My thanks are due to the late Provost of Eton, who most kindly lent me the whole body of the valuable MS. notes which he had accumulated . . . to Professor Key, to Mr. George Long, to Mr. Munro, who have most liberally permitted me to consult them, and to Dr. R. G. Latham for a most elaborate excursus on the ethnology of ancient Italy."—Preface.

RICHARD BENTLEY, New Burlington Street.

By Her Majesty's most Gracious Permission.

New published; and may be had at all Booksellers in Town and Country, 1 vol. 8vo. handsomely bound in cloth, 10s. 6d.

MEDITATIONS ON DEATH AND
ETERNITY.

Translated from the German by FREDERICA ROWAN.

London: TRÜBNER AND CO., 60, Paternoster Row;
and HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO., 33, Paternoster Row.

DE PORQUET'S STANDARD FRENCH
WORKS:—

DE PORQUET'S LE TRÉSOR DE L'ÉCOLIER FRANÇAIS, for turning English into French at Sight. 3s. 6d.

FRENCH INTERLOCUTOR (Complément du Trésor). 3s. 6d.

PARISIAN GRAMMAR. 3s. 6d.

CONVERSATIONAL EXERCISES, adapted to the Parisian Grammar. 3s. 6d.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY. 4s. 6d. bound.

SECRÉTAIRE PARISIEN. 3s. 6d.

HISTOIRE D'ANGLETERRE. 3s. 6d.

HISTORY OF ENGLAND, to translate into French. 3s. 6d.

TRADUCTEUR HISTORIQUE (Second French Reading-Book). 3s. 6d.

London: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., and may be had of the Author, at his Scholastic Agency, 14, Tavistock Street, Covent Garden.

Notice.

THE FIRST VOLUME of the LIFE
of the BISHOP OF EXETER will be PUBLISHED
on the FIRST of NOVEMBER.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street,
Hanover Square.

THE BISHOP of EXETER, MR.
SHUTTE, and the Saturday Review; see the Literary
Budget, post free for four stamps.

Office, 7, Burleigh Street, Strand, W. C.

ROBERT COCKS and Co.'s NEW PIANO-
FORTES. Warranted. Price 25*l.*, 35*l.*, and 42*l.* each.

ORGAN MUSIC. The Second Volume of
W. T. BEST's Collection of Organ Compositions, Ancient
and Modern. 12 Nos., 3*s.* each; or, Complete, cloth bds. 30*s.*
Lists of Mr. BEST'S Works may be had, gratis and post free.

HALF HOURS at the ORGAN. By JOHN
BISHOP. 12 books, 3*s.* each; or in one volume, bound
in cloth, 30*s.*

London: ROBERT COCKS and Co., New Burlington Street.

I 34 MASTERS, and 1000 VARIETIES, of
EXHIBITION and other PICTURES in PHOTO-
GRAPH, from 3*d.* to 2*s.* 9*d.* each. Classified and priced Catalogue
posted for a stamp. Selections for choice sent to the value of remit-
tance.

Also CROSSES, ART SUNDRIES, &c.

S. B. BEAL, 8, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Second Edition, revised, crown 8vo. with 4 Illustrations, cloth, 9*s.*

REMINISCENCES OF CAPTAIN
GRONOW,

FORMERLY OF THE GRENADIER GUARDS, AND M.P. FOR STAFFORD:

Being Anecdotes of the Camp, the Court, and the Clubs,
at the Close of the Last War with France.

RELATED BY HIMSELF.

London: SMITH, ELDER, AND CO., 65, Cornhill.

New Work on Borneo.

With 16 Coloured and Tinted Lithographs, and 3 Maps,
2 vols. demy 8vo. cloth, 32*s.*

LIFE IN THE FORESTS OF THE
FAR EAST.

BY SPENCER ST. JOHN.

Formerly H.M.'s Consul-General in Borneo, and now H.M.'s Charge d'Affaires to the
Republic of Hayti.

London: SMITH, ELDER, AND CO., 65, Cornhill.

New ready, post 8vo. cloth, 9*s.*

ESSAYS.

BY A BARRISTER.

Reprinted from the "Saturday Review."

London: SMITH, ELDER, AND CO., 65, Cornhill.

New Ready, in one vol., post 8vo.

BRITISH BIRDS IN THEIR HAUNTS. Being
a Popular Account of the Birds which have been observed in the British
Isles, their Haunts and Habits, their Systematic, Common, and Provincial
Names; together with a Synopsis of Genera, and a Brief Summary of Specific
Characters. By the Rev. C. A. JOHNS, B.A., F.L.S., Author of "Forest
Trees of Britain," "Flowers of the Field," &c. With Illustrations on Wood,
drawn by WOLF, engraved by WHYMPER.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—Depos-
itories:—London: 77, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, W.C.;
4, Royal Exchange, E.C.; and 48, Piccadilly, W.

TRACTS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

ILLUSTRATED WITH WOODCUTS.		Per 100.
No.		s. d.
1200.	THE WAY OF PEACE; a Conversation with a Policeman	3 0
1203.	ELIJAH; or, The Wandering Prophet housed and fed	3 0
1205.	A FAITHFUL WARNING LISTENED TO; or, If one Door shuts another opens	2 0
1213.	DOWN IN THE MEWS	2 0
1214.	SUDDEN DEATH. A True Story	3 0
1218.	HANNAH THOMPSON; or, the Forsaken Wife	2 0
1220.	MISSION WORK FOR ALL	0 0
1221.	THE STRIKE; or, Do you want a New Master?	3 0
1241.	THE TWO SHEPHERDS	3 0
1245.	THE MAN WHO LAID DOWN HIS LIFE FOR HIS FRIEND	4 0
1249.	HARVEST AND HARVEST HOME	2 0
1250.	HARVEST THOUGHTS	3 0
IN LARGE TYPE.		
917.	THE SUNDAY IDLER	1 0
921.	A DRINKER'S OPINION OF DRINK	2 0
925.	THE JUDGE WHO TREMBLED	4 0
929.	SLAB CASTLE; or, The Navy's Death Bed	6 0
950.	ONE GLASS MORE	4 0
991.	WHY DO YOU SWEAR!	4 0
1058.	SUNDAY	4 0
1158.	MORNING CHURCH; or, Two Meals better than One	7 0
1180.	A THREEFOLD ROBBER	4 0
1240.	ANOTHER HOME; or, Hope for the Old and Poor	5 0
1242.	DO YOU EVER GIVE THANKS FOR YOUR REASON?	3 0
1246.	I CANNOT THINK WHAT YOU WILL DO IN HEAVEN	2 0

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—Depos-
itories:—London: 77, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, W.C.;
4, Royal Exchange, E.C.; and 48, Piccadilly, W.

Just Published.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of
1862. By the Rev. A. W. THOROLD, M.A., Rector of St. Giles-
in-the-Fields. Fcap. 8vo. In neat glazed cover. Price Twopence.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—Depos-
itories:—London: 77, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, W.C.;
4, Royal Exchange, E.C.; and 48, Piccadilly, W.

MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND Co's.

Literary Announcements.

- VALIKANOW'S TRAVELS** in CENTRAL ASIA. Translated from the Russian, by Authority. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The ASIAN EXPEDITION.** Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welch Fusiliers. 8vo. 28s. [Ready.]
- The LIFE and TIMES of SIR JAMES GRAHAM.** By W. TORRENS M'CULLAGH. 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The AUSTRALIAN EXPEDITION; STUART's Explorations** into Southern Australia. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The HISTORY of the BRITISH NAVY,** from the Earliest Era to the Present Time. By C. D. YONGE, Esq., Author of "The Life of the Duke of Wellington." 2 vols. royal 8vo. with Plates, &c. [In Preparation.]
- NIPHON and PECHILI; Impressions of Japan and the North** of China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo. Illustrated. [Nearly Ready.]
- On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM** of NATURAL HISTORY. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. 8vo. 6s. [Ready.]
- The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS,** from 1842 to 1862. By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. 14s. [Ready.]
- MEMOIRS of the SPEAKERS of the HOUSE of COMMONS.** By WILLIAM NATHANIEL MASSEY, Esq., M.P., Author of "The History of England during the Reign of George III.," and Chairman of Ways and Means.
- TALES of the OUT-SPAN; or, Adventures in the Wilds of** Southern Africa. By CAPTAIN DRAYSON. Illustrated. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]
- MADAME DE STAEL and the GRAND DUCHESS LOUISE.** A selection from the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Madame de Staël, and the Grand Duchess Louise and Saxe Weimer, from 1800 to 1817; together with a letter to Bonaparte, First Consul; and another to Napoleon, Emperor. In 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The MARQUIS of DALHOUSIE'S ADMINISTRATION** of BRITISH INDIA. By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., of University College, Oxford. 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]
- LIFE on the NIGER; or the Journal of an African Trader.** [In Preparation.]
- The LIFE, TIMES, and WRITINGS of the BISHOP of EXETER.** By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, of St. Mary Steps, Exeter, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." [Vol. I. Nearly Ready.]
- The POLITICAL LIFE of the EARL of DERBY.** 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]
- Some ACCOUNT of BRITISH COLUMBIA.** By the Venerable the ARCHDEACON of BRITISH COLUMBIA. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The HISTORY of the CATHOLIC CHURCH** from the Day of Pentecost to the Present Time. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, of Sackville College. 4 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY.** By the Author of "Miriam May" and "Crispin Ken." 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]
- The LIFE and TIMES of LORD BOLINGBROKE.** [In Preparation.]
- The INFLUENCE of the CHURCH on the CIVILIZATION of the WORLD.** A Contribution to the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM LEE, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. In 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]
- FAITH and PEACE.** Being Answers to "Essays and Reviews" by Several Writers. With a Preface by the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]
- The CRUISE of the SAINT GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION.** 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The RELATION of CHURCH and STATE,** and the Nature and Effect of an Established Religion. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. [In Preparation.]
- The LATITUDINARIANS.** A Chapter of Church History from the Accession of Archbishop Tillotson, in 1691, to the Death of Archbishop Blackburne, in 1787. By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland. [In Preparation.]
- CALABRIA and the LIPARIAN ISLANDS in 1860.** 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The LIFE of the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.** [In Preparation.]
- The CHURCHES of the EAST.** By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. [In Preparation.]
- HISTORICAL MEMOIRS of the SUCCESSORS of SAINT PATRICK,** and the BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS of ARMAGH. By JAMES HEN-THORN TODD, D.D., F.S.A.; President of the Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. [In the Press.]
- ECCLESIA RESTITUTA.** By F. C. MASSINGBERD, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Ormsby. [In Preparation.]
- ECCLESIA VINDICATA: a Treatise on Appeals in Matters** Spiritual. With Suggestions for amending the Course of Proceeding in Appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. Dedicated (by permission) to the Earl of Derby, K.G. By JAMES WAYLAND JOYCE, M.A. 12mo. cloth, 5s. 6d.
- SERMONS** by the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's Church, Wakefield, with a Memoir of his Life. Edited by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [In Preparation.]
- The HISTORY of the CONSERVATIVE PARTY** from the Defection of Sir Robert Peel to the Present Time. [In Preparation.]
- BIBLIOLATRY; an Essay.** By the Rev. JAMES HUGHES, M.A. 12mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.
- NORTHERN EUROPE.** Denmark, Sweden, Russia, in 1861. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]
- RICHARD COBDEN.** A Biography.
- The HISTORY of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE,** Player and Poet, with New Facts and Traditions. By S. W. FULLOM, Author of "The Great Highway," &c. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]
- The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR,** and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the Last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo. 18s. [Ready.]
- The HELIOTROPIUM; or, Conformity of the Human Will** to the Divine. Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Draxellius, by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [Nearly Ready.]
- The SHANNON'S BRIGADE in INDIA.** By EDMUND HOPE VERNER, R.N. With Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND** from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. FERRY, Rector of Wadlington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. 21s. [New Ready.]
- A MIRROR in AMERICA; or, Political Analogies** Across the Atlantic. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. 8vo. 3s. 6d. [Ready.]
- ESSAYS on LITURGOLOGY and CHURCH HISTORY.** By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., of Sackville College. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]
- CRISPIN KEN.** By the Author of "Miriam May." Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Bart., M.P. 2 vols. post 8vo.; Cheap Edition, 7s., with "A Word to Churchmen." [Recently Published.]
- SPURS and SKIRTS.** By Allet. 1 vol. 10s. 6d.
- The WEIRD of the WENTWORTHS; a Tale of George IV's Time.** By JOHANNES SCOTUS. 2 vols. 21s.
- RECOLLECTIONS of a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN.** 8vo. cloth, 5s.
- The VALLEY of the MAUDE.** By the Author of "Athel-ine; or, the Castle by the Sea." 3 vols. 31s. 6d. [Ready.]
- The AMERICAN CHURCH and the AMERICAN UNION.** By HENRY CASHWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]
- RECOLLECTIONS of LABRADOR LIFE.** 7s. 6d.
- WHEAT and TARES.** Originally published in "Fraser's Magazine." Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.
- BETTER DAYS.** Edited by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." 2 vols. 21s.
- The DREAM of a LIFE.** By Lady SCOTT. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.
- The CURATE of CRANSTON.** By CUTHBERT BEND, Author of "Mr. Verdant Green," &c. 10s. 6d.
- A WOMAN'S LIFE.** A Novel. 2 vols. 21s.
- LIFE AMONGST the COLLIERIES.** 5s.
- LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND.** Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.
- The LITERARY WOMEN of ENGLAND.** 8vo. 18s.
- CHURCH RATE a NATIONAL TRUST.** By the Venerable Archdeacon DENISON. 8vo. 5s. New Edition.
- The LIFE of Dr. WOLFF.** New and cheap edition, revised and enlarged, with full-length portraits. 8vo. 12s.
- The CIRCUMNAVIGATION of the GLOBE** by the Austrian Frigate Novara. English Edition. Containing an unpublished letter from Baron Humboldt. With numerous wood engravings. Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Roderick Murchison. 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. now ready, 30s.
- CONSTANCE MORDAUNT; or, Life in the Western** Archipelago. 2 vols. 21s.
- The STAR of LOVELL: a Tale of the Poor Clergy.** 3 vols. 31s. 6d.
- The FIELD of LIFE: or, Sowing and Reaping.** Second Edition. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.
- CLINTON MAYNYARD; A Tale of the World, the Flesh,** and the Devil. 10s. 6d.
- Why PAUL FERROLL KILLED his WIFE.** New and Cheap Edition. 5s.
- The LIFE and CORRESPONDENCE of LORD BACON:** a Reply to Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Personal History of Bacon." 8vo. 14s.
- REMARKS on ESSAYS and REVIEWS.** By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Madras. 1s. 6d.
- The CHARGE of the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON,** 1862. 4d.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO. 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

Church and State Review.

No. 5, Vol. 1.

October 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

The Primacy.



THE *amplificatores presentis temporis* are even more numerous than the *laudatores temporis acti*. The disposition to overestimate the importance of our own times is a more universal and a stronger feeling than the overweening and querulous regret for times gone by. Many people pass all their life in the atmosphere of crises and climaxes. Public events are to them matter either of boundless exultation or of hopeless despondency.

This way of viewing things does not help to make a useful man. It supplies idle men with apologies for idleness: timid men with apologies for cowardice: excited men with apologies for violence: selfish men with apologies for selfishness: domineering men with apologies for intolerance. It helps no man to make the best of things. It helps all men to make the worst of them.

And, besides all this, there is a want of faith in it, as if there were no other agency concerned with events and their issues but human agency. There is also a disregard of facts. In a settled and well-ordered country like our own, single events, of whatever magnitude in themselves, have no such power, either for good or evil, as they are taken to have by these optimists and pessimists. English institutions and English society are a chain of links so many, and so complicated and intertwined, that one a little stronger or a little weaker, or a little crooked, or even a little broken, produces no perceptible effect upon the strength of the chain. But as there are always a good many of us who live upon excitement of one kind or another, and the class is unhappily largely on the increase, there are more than enough reasons to make it the duty of those who seek to guide public opinion to try what they can do towards producing a healthier state of mind touching particular events and prospects.

Quidnunkery, the appetite which craves after and feeds upon to excess the events of the day, belongs, for obvious reasons, more universally to the political life than to any other. But if not in its frequency, yet in its strength, it is developed most of all in the life ecclesiastical and religious. The weaknesses of men, as their virtues, are most gathered round, and intensified by connection with, that which is the highest matter of human concern.

So, at this time, "Who is to be Primate?" *Quid nunc?* When the appointment shall have been made, and this excitement over, it will be, *Quid tum?* "What will the Primate do?" Now what we want Church-people to consider a little is that neither the one nor the other, though things certainly important in themselves, are of that overwhelming consequence with which quidnunkery and quidtummary would invest them. The Church of England was not made by an Archbishop of Canterbury, and will not be unmade by an Archbishop of Canterbury. The Church of England may certainly—on an extreme supposition and one not warranted by experience—accept, with little questioning, the influence and guidance of an Archbishop of Canterbury, and there might be nothing slavish about the obedience. But there is no possible appointment to the vacant Primacy which can supply ground for the expectation. So far from it, there is no likelihood that the appointment when made will be one in which Churchmen can rejoice, save by way of contrast and comparison.

Quid tum? Now consider a little. What effect had the primacy of Archbishop Sumner upon the position and the Faith of the Church of England? Take one point of the position. Archbishop Sumner, when Bishop of Chester, was in 1847 of all the bishops the most emphatic in expressing his apprehension of the policy of the Committee of Council on "Education," then first plainly developed in the management clause business. In 1848 the Bishop of Chester became Archbishop, and from that hour supported the Committee of Council. We are writing from information supplied to us by one of the lay members of the Committee of the National Society, now deceased, and proved all through by documents. No doubt the course of the Archbishop helped the Committee of Council to impose upon the Church of England the inequitable terms which they did impose shortly after. But the reaction has come, and the natural sequel of the wrong perpetrated in 1848 to 1852 is bearing fruit in the action of Churchmen in and out of Parliament. When Churchmen see clearly that a thing is wrong and should be redressed it will be redressed. School teaching is a very good thing under conditions. But school teaching such as finds favour with the Committee of Council is a very bad thing. It puts aside, in subordination to its own "liberal" and economical traditions, Creeds and Catechisms and

such like, and indeed all notion of fixed and necessary Truth. All this is bad enough. Especially is it bad, when, as at present, it is largely promoted by the Committee of that particular Church Society which has it in charge to provide against every approach to it. But the end is worse, for the end is Socinianism. Archbishop Sumner—we believe unconsciously—helped on this state of things, but before his death the reaction had come.

Again, in respect of the Faith of the Church. The late Primate was no maintainer of the doctrine of the Sacraments as held and taught by the Church of England. His course in the Gorham case is well known. Now let us hear what the *Times* says about the result of the Gorham case. It says that it "determined that a clergyman of the Church of England need not believe in baptismal regeneration."* We are not endorsing this description; the fallacy of it is on the surface: we cite it only as an expression of popular belief. Again, his opinions touching the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper need no comment in this place. Now it is one of the best ascertained facts of the present state of the Church in these primary particulars that at no time has the doctrine of both Sacraments been better understood and more firmly grasped amongst us than during the last twelve years; that is to say, pending and since the Baptismal and Eucharistic controversies, in both of which the Archbishop took so prominent a part on the adverse side.

It is not only then upon general principles—upon grounds of faith and quietness and confidence—but upon the evidence and warrant of late and patent facts, that we say to Church-people, Be not over anxious and troubled about who shall be Primate, or about what the Primate shall do. Even though he should be so ill-advised as to counsel the laying a finger upon the Prayer Book: even though he should prove to be a disciple of that worst of all heresies—from any suspicion of which Archbishop Sumner was wholly free—the heresy of the neologists; the heresy which, yielding to the temptation of "the pride of life," would invent a new volume of Holy Scripture, and which is labouring, under some favouring circumstances, to fasten its poisonous fangs in the vitals of the Church of England, his position and influence would only serve to call forth in wider extent, and in deeper earnestness, the living protest of a sound and implicit faith.

No doubt the appointment to the Primacy of the Church of England is an important matter. The highest place in a Church which has the highest mission in the earth, and the most abundant power to discharge it, can have nothing about it which is not important. No doubt there are things in the political and social and religious condition of the country to make even soberminded and trustful men anxious about the filling of the place: but no more perhaps than at any other time; and all such anxiety is right only when it bears fruit, not in fears for the ultimate issue; not in exaggerated fancies touching the importance of this or that particular event, or this or that particular prospect, but in that increase of humble and faithful obedience which has the hope that "maketh not ashamed," and the promise that never fails.

* *The Times*, Monday, September 8, 1862.

Political Parties. House of Lords.

SOME late remarks on the subject of political parties were confined to the House of Commons; but it is perhaps hardly less important to determine their character and value in the House of Lords. No part, indeed, of the Constitution is more frequently subject to a misapprehension of the powers, the functions, and the duties which belong to it, and nowhere is it more difficult to find the practical mean of action between the precedents of the past and the altered conditions of the present times, between a tendency on one side to magnify, and a still greater disposition on the other to abate its authority or depreciate its influence. And this difficulty sometimes arises from comparing the two branches of the Legislature, which are very different in composition, in procedure, and, it may be said, in the work which is to be done. The House of Lords indeed, though founded on and jealously limited by hereditary right—for the election of Scotch and Irish peers, and the succession of bishops to seats within its walls do not really disturb the principle,—is not less a representative body, not less furnished with legislative powers in all their fulness and stringency; but it speaks in a different tone, it reflects a different side of the national feeling, and it modifies the exercise of its authority by considerations wholly foreign to the House of Commons.

It follows from this that it is at once easier and harder to trace the existence and limits of political parties in the Upper than the Lower House—easier, because a broad and ostensible classification of Whigs, Conservatives, and Cross-benches is possible; harder, because personal ability has here a wider play, and party organization is frequently lost in the subtle undercurrent of individual character and specialties. In that refined, highly-educated, and fastidious assembly, where all are equals, and where consequently it is less easy to rise, but also when risen less difficult to maintain the position gained, the broad features of a popular body are wanting, and the lines of division are often rather to be guessed by instinct than to be laid down by definition.

A casual observer would not improbably select the recognized existence of the Cross-benches as one of the chief characteristics. It is unquestionably a feature well worthy of note, and expresses that moderation of tone and temper which honourably distinguishes the debates: but it may perhaps be doubted whether the direct weight, which is sometimes presumed, attaches to the action of this section of the House. Where the question at issue is not only an open and a fairly debateable one, but is outside the attraction of politics, the division and the vote are generally governed by the judgment of the individual; but where party contention enters in, it is the tendency of the Cross-benches now, as it was two centuries ago the tendency of the House generally, to give their support to the ministers of the Crown. Indirectly, however, the Cross-benches affect as well as represent the general character of the House. Moderate in the midst of

a body which, though itself inclined to moderation, is subject to the action and reaction of political feeling, they continually hold up to the House that temperate and weighty form of deliberation which senates have often sought, but which has rarely been found except in the House of Lords. It is not easy to say how large a part of those independent and comprehensive debates which exercise upon the public mind an influence, that grows with the growth of education and general intelligence, is due to the Cross-benches.

Whilst, then, it will always be an object with any Government to maintain in the House of Lords a position of political equality if not of actual command, it is worth noticing that for many years past, and under circumstances apparently very favourable to themselves, the Liberal party have never obtained a majority. The crushing defeat of the Reform Bill was neutralized by the admirable tact and judgment with which the Duke of Wellington held together and directed the strength of the Tory Peers: the ruinous dissolution of Peel's Conservative party, and the alienation of their ablest men in the disastrous struggle on the Corn-laws, failed to destroy them. The errors of friends, the rancour of enemies, the perfidy of renegades, and the long exile from office have been marked neither by defective powers of debate nor by a period of wholly barren opposition. The present Government, indeed, have plainly shown their own sense of the weakness of their position by their continual attempts to improve it: but it may be doubted whether the few votes of individual Peers have not been dearly purchased by a loss of confidence on the part first of the House, and next of that large section of the community in whose eyes the rights and character of the House, have a great constitutional value. Perhaps one of the heaviest charges which can be justly urged against the present and former Whig Governments is the unscrupulous licence that they have claimed in tampering with the numbers, the composition, and the functions of the Upper House.

It would be unjust to draw an inference against the political conduct of any party from a single act of whatever nature: but when a long succession of acts stamped with a common character, and converging upon a common end, can be traced through the course of many years, it is not unfair to presume the existence, if not of a definite policy, at all events of a strong bias. This is particularly true of the Whigs. Espousing sometimes the part of the Crown, and sometimes that of the people, they have—though deriving their strength from their connection with the “great houses”—uniformly shown an antagonism towards the House of Lords. When in 1832 it was resolved to deter from the exercise of their legislative powers the dissentient Peers by the menace of new creations, it was a Whig minister who made the threat; and when subsequently it was found hard to secure a majority for Government measures, the silent but perceptible infusion of the Whig element, which every session has witnessed, has almost justified Lord Sunderland's famous taunt, that the Crown might turn a troop of the Household brigade into the House of Lords.

But the independence which, in 1832, the Whigs

failed to break by the threat of unlimited creations, in 1856 they attempted to modify by the introduction of life peerages. That which Mr. Pitt would not do when pressed by a great constitutional difficulty in effecting the union with Ireland, which Lord Grey did not do in the heat of the Reform struggle, which in an earlier generation Bolingbroke and Oxford were denounced for doing in principle, even to a very limited extent; that in fact for which precedents are only to be found in the profligate Court of Charles II, the Whigs, without the pretence of a political necessity, sought to force upon the House of Lords. The most bitter enemy to that House could not devise a more fatal engine of attack. A deluge of new creations, though a heavy blow to its independence, was not the heaviest. Time might perhaps modify, public opinion might restrain, an extreme abuse of such a prerogative: but neither time nor public inclination can bring back constitutional powers once taken away, or can restore to vital usefulness an assembly whose authority rests upon the influences which immemorial antiquity and hereditary descent create, when once it is degraded in popular estimation. Another attempt followed. It was determined to limit—and limitation was the equivalent of destruction—the jurisdiction of the House of Lords in that branch of political economy which in modern times includes all others. The field of finance was chosen, threats of a dissolution were freely circulated, and a minister was put forward who was at once the ablest and the most unpopular of the cabinet. In the event of success his ability would best bear the brunt of the conflict, and in the event of failure his unpopularity would provide his colleagues with a ready victim who had many enemies, and, above all, was himself not a Whig. Thus reviving the controversies of other days, but influenced by a strangely mistaken notion of the public temper, and asserting privileges on behalf of the House of Commons more exclusive than that House had either claimed before or now cared to contend for, the Whig Government sought to restrain the Peers from putting a simple negative on a bill which repealed 1,400,000*l.* taxation. Had they, indeed, succeeded in these attempts, not only the judicial and the financial, but also the legislative powers of the House of Lords would have irretrievably perished, and the Peerage of England would have been cut down to the ignoble proportions of a French Senate. Fortunately, however, the good sense of the country intervened, and the firmness of the House, in each case acting—as it was well said—upon the right, that is inherent in every legislative body, of being the judges of their own privileges, and the interpreters of those laws which regulate their rights, carried the day against the ministry which attempted to force, and the partisans who were not ashamed to support, a policy which degraded their own order.

It has been frequently observed that the discussion of important subjects suffers no discredit in the House of Lords, and is sometimes even treated with a greater breadth, logic, and dignity than is possible amidst the personal rivalries and electoral influences of the Lower House. But it is, perhaps, more difficult to assign to each party in the House of Lords the exact proportion of oratorical and par-

liamentary ability which belongs to it. The balance, indeed, of debate, though from various causes generally inclining in favour of the Conservative Opposition, is not unequally maintained. If, indeed, questions were discussed at the length usual in the House of Commons the results might be different; for whilst on the Ministerial benches is to be found a larger number of speakers who rise to, or a little above, mediocrity, on the Opposition side there are a few statesmen and orators whose pre-eminence is absolutely unapproached. This singular difference between the two great parties deserves all the more notice that it has afforded a seeming justification, if it be not the cause, of recent reinforcements to the ministerial ranks. Of mere cabinet ministers, who, from reasons of age, incompetence, or party convenience, are draughted into the asylum which is offered by the Upper House—the Llanovers, Lyvedens, Tauntons—it is needless to take account: but in the late Lord Herbert, in Lord Russell, and in the present Lord Chancellor, the Government received no mean accession of administrative experience and oratorical weight.

Yet, with all these advantages, the Whigs have not as yet obtained a marked predominance in debate, and it may be questioned whether even the number of their supporters and the extent of their influence have greatly increased. To those who look below the surface of passing events the reason of this will be sufficiently clear. In the House of Lords there is and always has been an inherent tendency towards Conservatism in the broadest sense of the term. The descent of their hereditary honours, the nearness of their relationship to the Church and the Crown, their close connection with the soil and those who live by it, conspire to rally round the Peerage the conservative instincts of property, and to identify their existence with that of the Constitution. It is true that a party which is long in office will always count amongst its members many who are destitute of political faith, and whose scruples are in strict subordination to the interests of the day. Janissaries to be hired and apostates to be seduced, no less than sincere converts to be won, there always must be: but, setting aside these minute subdivisions which belong to every party in every legislative assembly, there is an under-current in the House of Lords which happily diverts the most restless demagogues to more moderate counsels: and it is frequently in the mouth of such men as Lord Grey, Lord Monteagle, or Lord Overstone, that the severest but most salutary criticism of Government measures lies.

There will be, then, this difference between the two branches of our Legislature, that, whilst in the House of Commons the weight, disposition, and numbers of the political parties form the principal consideration and cause of anxiety, in the hereditary chamber the question of parties is subordinate to the general character, capacity, and composition of the House.

As at present constituted, the House of Lords can probably command an amount of administrative knowledge and parliamentary ability sufficient to do justice to any questions that can be reasonably anticipated. Oratorically they are at least equal; practically from education, habit, and the absence of electoral

influences they are superior to the House of Commons in the treatment of many subjects which belong to the higher regions of political speculation. Nor are they less open to legitimate impression by public influences and feelings around them. It is to the credit of those chiefs of the Conservative party, who, commanding a majority though in opposition, have been the real leaders of the House of Lords for the last thirty years, that they have so sparingly and wisely exercised their power, that—excluding the Corn-law question, which is an exceptional one—the House has never been committed to one unnecessary or unsuccessful conflict with the Country or the Commons. Thus, although based upon hereditary right and steadily representing the most ancient parts and principles of a Constitution, which has always been growing and never stationary, the House of Lords has maintained its relative pace and position to the necessities and temper of a versatile and perplexing age. And they greatly err who, whether as friends or enemies, count upon the willingness or ability of the House of Lords to maintain a mere policy of obstruction and exclusion even in cases where obstruction or exclusion is by many thought desirable. Like one of those venerable buildings which mediæval architecture has bequeathed to us, but to which modern necessities have added every appliance whether of strength or of ornament, that a growing civilization can suggest, never dissociated from the traditions of the past, though in entire unison with the institutions of the present, gaining in moral influence what it surrenders of actual authority, the House of Lords still stands in undiminished dignity. It is the lineal descendant of the same body that advised the Plantagenets, confronted the Tudors, and, when with the abdication of James II. and the loss of the Great Seal, society seemed for a while reduced to its original elements, survived alone amongst all our institutions to represent and to maintain order in the midst of anarchy. Unlike the senates of other countries, it has never been restored or remodelled, because it has never ceased to exist: and it is a singular illustration of the continuity of its political life that to this hour are preserved in its journals the name of every Peer who for centuries past, through the Wars of the Roses, the Reformation, the Rebellion, the Revolution, has attended each sitting of the House.

Every change, indeed, which is openly imported or which gradually creeps into the body of the Constitution has some effect upon the character and functions of the Peerage: and with each change there is amongst those who exercise an influence need of those rare qualities which can appreciate the temper of the country and the value of the matter which is at issue. As yet most of these changes have been met half way, and none have inflicted real mischief. During the twelvemonth which succeeded to their rejection of Mr. Gladstone's repeal of the paper duty, the radical press was never weary of repeating that the House of Lords, so far from diminishing, had increased its legislative powers by an usurpation in the domain of finance. It is impossible within these limits to discuss that question. It is enough here to say that the judgment of the country approved, and the financial

results of the next year justified, the course then adopted. For if even it were conceded that the vote of the House of Lords on that memorable night was an actual enlargement of their existing powers, it was an enlargement warranted by the spirit of our general system, and perhaps already involved in the constitutional changes of recent times. There have been periods in our history when the Lords claimed an immunity from taxation; or when, either separately or jointly with the Crown, they could outweigh every other influence in the State; or when, by territorial authority, they could command a majority of votes in the Lower House. At such times a jealousy of parliamentary privilege was dictated by true political wisdom. But when, as at present, the House of Commons grows slack in its former scrutiny of public expenditure, and the House of Lords is the sole check to an absorption by the Commons of the executive powers of the State, the jealousy which was becoming in a Tudor or a Stuart Parliament is as much out of place as would be a claim by the Crown to revive the dispensing power, or by the Barons to re-enact the forest laws, or by both Houses to send the reporters of their debates to Newgate or the Marshalsea for a breach of privilege.

At the same time the true region of the Lords' financial authority will be found to lie in neither of the extremes which have sometimes been claimed for them. Whilst it is essential to the public welfare that they should criticise and have complete freedom to accept, to reject, and even within certain limits to amend, the financial proposals which come to them from the Commons, it is in the interest neither of themselves nor of the country that they should originate or divide with the Lower House the responsibility of those measures. And this is dictated as much by the common sense of "Parliamentary Government" as by any fixed rule of politics; it is as much in harmony with the English Constitution as it is justified by the best practice of those countries in which the experiment of Constitutional Government has been tried. Count Cavour, whilst on one occasion he reconciled a difference between the two Chambers by a dissolution of the deputies, which ultimately obliged the Upper House to give way, on another occasion defended with equal success the rights of the Senate and their competency to deal with the budget.

Such, if it be a friendly, is not an exaggerated account of the House of Lords. There is, however, another side of the picture. There are many defects which are alleged; there are some real difficulties which exist. On a future occasion we may return to them; meanwhile it may fairly be said that, in spite of the drawbacks which are inseparable from a legislative assembly so constituted, the services which the Lords have of recent years rendered to Church and State have been neither few nor unimportant; and it is probable that since the great electoral revolution of 1832 there has never been a time when their influence has been wider, or their character has stood higher for the qualities which win respect and confidence from a free but conservative people.

The Scandinavian Alliance.



ABOUT a year ago it was first said that the heir to the Crown of England had been greatly charmed by the Princess Alexandra of Denmark. On his way to the great Prussian reviews which were held in September last year, on the Rhine, the Prince saw the Princess at Ostend, and soon afterwards was a guest at the Castle of Rumpenheim, in Electoral Hesse, where the Princess was staying with her father's father-in-law, Landgrave William of Hesse Cassel. Then for the first time the probability of a royal matrimonial alliance between England and Denmark assumed some defined shape.

Curiously enough, a fortnight before these incidents, an alliance of a different kind, and on the part of another Scandinavian Power, was projected and conditionally determined upon at the Court of France. Charles XV. of Sweden, grandson of the French General Bernadotte, was at that time on a visit to the Emperor Napoleon III. at Paris; and by some of the strange ways which diplomatists have at command, it became known that a secret arrangement had been come to by the two sovereigns, in virtue of which the King of Sweden was to begin playing an ambitious game on the Baltic, supported morally and materially by the Emperor of the French. Charles XV, youthful and ambitious of military glory, longed to repeat in the North the rôle which Victor Emmanuel had played in the South; and the Emperor of the French was to go to his help, if required, in the same way as he had intervened on behalf of the King of Sardinia. The heirless King of Denmark had been likewise invited to Paris, but at the last moment he drew back and excused himself, greatly to the displeasure of the Sovereign of the Tuileries.

We state nothing but what is known to be true by certain statesmen in this country when we say that the grand purport of the secret agreement concluded between the monarchs of France and Sweden was that King Charles XV. was to have his dominions aggrandised by the conquest of Finland on the east, and on the west by the absorption of Denmark, in return for his co-operation with France, whenever a necessity should arise, by disturbing or attacking either Russia in Finland or Prussia through Holstein. Such an alliance also would have been of great service to the Emperor of the French, by gaining to his side the fleet and excellent sailors of Scandinavia in the event of a rupture with England. Of the agitation which was immediately commenced in Finland against the Russian government we need not speak, as it does not relate to the question in hand; but a Swedish propaganda at the same time commenced its operations in Denmark, not only in the towns but in the villages. Not to shock too violently the national feelings of the Danes, the propagandists preached, not the absorption of Denmark into Sweden, but a species of confederation under the sceptre of the descendant of Bernadotte. It was also preached that in these times treaties are easily torn up, and that the opportunity should be seized for annulling

the "London protocol," and the Act of Succession to the throne of Denmark based upon it. At the same time the hereditary Prince Christian of Denmark was most industriously calumniated, as having anti-national tendencies, &c.

Within the last few weeks the announcement of the intended marriage of the Prince of Wales has brought into notice the hitherto little-known subject of the succession to the Danish throne: but it may be well briefly to state the facts. The King of Denmark has contracted a Morganatic marriage, having married a lady of private station in his own capital; and moreover he has no children. Such a position always invites intrigue, and threatens a country with serious internal feuds and external difficulties. Therefore it was that some ten years ago the European Powers took the matter into consideration; and by the "London protocol," and the Act of Succession which followed, it was decreed that Prince Christian of Holstein-Sonderberg should be recognized as heir to the Danish Crown. The Prince was only a distant relative of the King, and there were many competitors who were as nearly, some of them more nearly, related to the reigning house than he was. But his attitude upon the Schleswig-Holstein question had separated him from a host of other distant and undistinguished claimants; and in consequence of the part he took in that question a Danish title had been conferred upon him. A year ago it was the object of the Swedish King to have this Act of Succession annulled, and thus to leave the throne of Denmark without any direct heir, in order to facilitate the absorption of Denmark under his own crown. And as it was stipulated by the Act of Succession that the accession of Prince Christian to the throne should be conditional upon the consent and approval of the Danish people, every means to render the Prince unpopular was had recourse to by the Swedish propaganda.

A year is passed, and all is changed. The jealous opposition of the King of Sweden to the heir of the Danish throne has suddenly given way to feelings the very opposite. Charles XV. has altered his policy, and has thereby removed a great political difficulty which would have constituted a drawback upon the contemplated matrimonial alliance between the family of our Queen and that of Prince Christian of Denmark. The difficulty which the ambition of King Charles XV, encouraged by the Emperor of the French, had raised, has been solved in a manner which will happily secure the Scandinavian kingdoms against any such danger in the future, and moreover gives promise of uniting them on equal terms, and by mutual consent, into one powerful and harmonious kingdom. Prince Christian, the heir to the Crown of Denmark, has a tolerably large family; Charles of Sweden has only one daughter. It is now settled that the eldest son of Prince Christian is to marry the only daughter of the King of Sweden: so that, when Charles of Sweden, on the one hand, and the present King of Denmark and his immediate heir, Prince Christian, on the other, shall have passed from the scene, the Crowns of Sweden and Denmark will be virtually united, as the King of Denmark will then be husband of the Queen of Sweden; and in the generation following the crowns will be united *de facto* upon the head of their offspring.

This will be a happy consummation in the eyes of the Scandinavians; it is desirable also as a matter of European policy. During the last year especially we have had proofs of the warm feeling of fraternity between the Danes on the one hand, and the people of Norway and Sweden on the other. The yearning on the part of these severed sections of the same race to reunite is unmistakable. Feelings, habits, interest, all alike counsel union and unity. There is a matchless homogeneity in these northern nations, which peculiarly fits them for union. The population of France, comparatively homogeneous as it is, is diversity itself compared with the oneness of race, habits, and feelings which mark the Scandinavian nations. For this they are indebted chiefly to their geographical position. The Baltic and the snows of Bothnia isolate Norway and Sweden: they are almost inaccessible, and wholly unattractive to the eye of rover or conqueror. Denmark, though less isolated and less uninviting, is still sufficiently out of the path of conquest and settlement to have suffered little from the inroads and settlements of foreign peoples. Hence the rare homogeneousness of the population on both sides of the Sound. Equally fond of the sea and of freedom, equally brave and frank, hating intrigue, and, what is also of importance, each in the same stage of material civilization as the other, there is hardly a single point of difference between them. The union of these kingdoms by the peaceful means of matrimony will obviate the only difficulty: for by this means they will be united on equal terms, and by a process which, being visible beforehand, will be gradual as well as acceptable. Such an accomplishment of Scandinavian unity will be in perfect harmony with the national and political tendencies of Europe. Everywhere we see the tendency on the part of nations to accomplish their unity. We have seen it in Italy; in dreamy peaceful fashion it is equally conspicuous in Germany. The Scandinavian Powers, though not rich either in population or resources, and almost valueless as military powers, occupy a strategical position of immense importance in naval warfare. Severed as they now are, neither of them could defend its own position—Sweden against Russia, Denmark against Germany. But if united, their seamen are so excellent, and their position so isolated, as to render their frontiers comparatively secure. They would need little assistance from any allied power, and yet if that power were a maritime power like England, they could render it in return the most important service. They hold the gates of the Baltic. Rifled cannon have now rendered these narrow straits totally impassable in the face of the batteries which crown the heights on either shore. Even in former times, Nelson only got through by hugging the Swedish shore, the batteries on which side did not open fire. At present we are at peace, and we ever wish to remain at peace; but should the old and formidable project of Maritime Confederacy be again tried against us—a project which it required all the naval genius of Nelson, and the secrecy and promptitude of the Copenhagen expedition, to foil—we shall be at no loss to comprehend the importance of having the gates of the Baltic held by a friendly power. The cutting off the co-operation of the Russian fleet against us would

be tantamount to an addition to our navy of twenty sail of the line.

All dynastic rivalry between the Swedish and Danish dynasties is henceforth at an end. Charles XV. is now as willing to support the right of Prince Christian to the throne of Denmark as a year ago he was to oppose it. And before Prince Christian's eldest son weds the only daughter of the King of Sweden, his eldest daughter will have become the consort of the heir to the throne of England. We think this a most happy and, of all others, a most natural alliance. The Danes and English are more than kindred. They have given to the British race the best portion of its blood. To our Scandinavian forefathers we owe our national love of the sea, our spirit of enterprise and adventure which carries us into all parts of the world, and also, to them at least as much as to the Saxons, our love of freedom and free institutions. Our summer tourists in Denmark, in Norway, or in Sweden, feel more at home with the people than with any other in Europe. Although more primitive in habits, and with little of the luxury which wealth permits to English society, they greatly resemble us in features and modes of thought. The fair-haired maidens there, but for their quaint costume and strange speech, might be English peasant girls; and the cheerful, stalwart, hearty-looking men would very creditably represent John Bull. We do not overrate the political importance of a matrimonial connection between the royal families of England and Denmark. Such connections have not the importance they once had: for the will of the nation has supplanted the mere personal will of the sovereign,—and “nations,” as Lord Palmerston once said, “have no cousins.” In this case, however, the aphorism does not hold good: for the Scandinavians and ourselves are cousins. And without attaching undue weight to the new relationship about to be formed between the two countries, we may at least hail it with satisfaction, as certain to make either nation think more of the other, and in so doing to perceive the striking similarity of character and community of interest which exist between them. We are happy to feel assured that it is not as a political match that this marriage is to be contracted by the son of our beloved Queen, and that the bride elect possesses in an eminent degree those advantages of person, charms of manner, and piety and amiability of character which captivate affection and secure domestic happiness. Nevertheless, while as a good princess and queen she will win our hearts, it will be an additional pleasure to feel that, as sister of the Scandinavian King, she will rivet an old and natural alliance, draw into closer bonds the kindred races of the North.

Harvest-home.



THE Harvest-homes which are beginning to find a place in the rural economy of England have been devised with a threefold purpose. The first purpose has been to remove, as far as possible, from such occasions of rejoicing, temptation to excess and riot. The second, to

secure an annual holiday on which all classes of parishioners may assemble in genial and kindly intercourse and join in innocent amusement. The third—that which sanctifies all the intercourse and recreation of Christian people—the inauguration of the festival with the assembling as many of the parishioners as can come together for praise and thanksgiving in the parish church.

Thus the specific idea which the word “Harvest-home” is intended to convey is—in place of revel, private or public—a Church festival; *i.e.* a feast in which the Church takes her own proper position. This is the leading and guiding idea, although the details must necessarily vary according to the circumstances of place and people. In some parishes a special extra Service on a certain Sunday, or a Service on a Wednesday evening (followed, in at least one instance, by a Prayer-meeting in the schoolroom), has constituted the harvest festival; but this mode of celebration, however commendable, scarcely seems sufficient, except in the case of the great mother church of the diocese, of which an example was set last year by Ely Cathedral, where, on the afternoon of market day, the Service was specially intended for a harvest commemoration, and the decorations of the cathedral, no less than the anthem, hymn, and sermon were all made suitable to the occasion.

Our idea of a harvest festival is the old harvest-home supper conducted on parochial principles, and preceded by prayer and thanksgiving in the House of God. And this is the commonly received idea attached to the words. The whole parish is regarded as one family, who, on a *week-day*, devoted to that especial purpose, assemble themselves in their parish church, and afterwards partake of a common meal, all separation of classes being laid aside, and the rich and poor meeting on one footing, alike at church and table. The week-day seems more appropriate for the celebration than the Sunday, because it entails a greater sacrifice of time, and permits of the subsequent sports and dinner. The harvest festival, in short, aims to be what festivals commonly were, a combination of the religious and secular,—a holy day and a holiday,—a friendly gathering of the members of the parish who wish to sanctify their festive proceedings by first assembling in the house of prayer.

Duty to God and to our neighbour should constrain us to assist in the establishment of harvest festivals in our respective parishes; for thereby we show our gratitude to God for His bounties, in a manner so lively and impressive that men are the more stirred up to read a lesson which is taught them at a season of the year with which so many sacred truths and themes are inseparably blended, and from which so many symbols of holy hope are taken.

It is natural to celebrate the in-gathering of the corn more than any other of those fruits of the earth which are given to us in their due season—the hay-harvest, for example, or the yield of hops and apples, on which, in certain districts, the occupiers of land depend more than upon their corn. The festival seems especially to belong to the time of wheat harvest, because, as bread is the staff of life, so the cereal crops are the representatives to

us of the fruits of the earth. In certain of God's gifts special classes would appear to be more benefited than others; but this cannot be said of corn, which is pre-eminently a national gift, and one in which the consumers, if not the producers, are spread through the length and breadth of the land. The whole nation is vitally concerned in the productiveness of the grain crops; and the cornfields of any given district do not represent so much money distributed among the farmers, labourers, and millers of that particular locality, but the food of hundreds at a distance from the spot. The "joy in harvest" spreads beyond the actual limits of the harvest field, and is diffused throughout the whole nation; and, for this reason, the rejoicings at a harvest festival should not be confined to landlord, tenant, and labourer, but should be shared in by their neighbours of all ranks and classes. They all unite to form the body politic; no one class can say to the other, "I have no need of thee;" and, if they wish to give a lively demonstration of this often-overlooked truth, they can most opportunely do so by joining together with one heart and mind in a harvest festival. As yet the clergy are not fully directed in this matter, although the subject has been taken up in Convocation; and here and there—as, for example, in the diocese of Norwich, and Bath and Wells—a sanction has been accorded by our bishops to the introduction of annual harvest festivals into the parochial system. The special form of service which has for some time been under consideration by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and has passed both Houses of that Province, has been delayed upon a point of form in the Northern Convocation.

On what system, then, should the harvest festival be conducted? Perhaps we can reply to this question with most advantage to our readers by a condensed reference to the programmes of upwards of fifty such festivals, held in various counties during the autumn of 1861, of which we have obtained full accounts, including the important items of the amount of provisions and expense. Undoubtedly, then, the opening proceedings must be with a Church Service, so that our first-fruits may be hallowed, and that we may humble ourselves before God, and acknowledge His mercies to us, before we proceed to secular enjoyments. We find that the Special Service was held last year at various hours,—at 10.30, 11, 11.30, 12, 1.30, 2, 2.30, and 3 o'clock; in every case there would appear to have been a sermon; and, in a few instances, the Holy Communion was administered. In still fewer instances a second Evening Service took place. In the instances where the Church Service was held at noon the Afternoon Service was used, or the Litany. In many instances collections were made after the Service, the Offertory being devoted to some local charity (as the County Infirmary) or distributed among Missions.

The programmes differ in other particulars as widely as in the hours of Divine Service. Thus, in some places there was a dinner only; in others, a dinner and tea; and in others, a tea and supper, without dinner. In some cases the women were admitted to the dinner; in others, they did not appear till the tea-time. In some cases the labourers

dined at their respective employer's, and then came to the place appointed for the general sports, and for the tea; in other cases (and these form the majority) the dinner was made parochial. The time of day at which the eating and drinking portion of the festival took place necessarily varied with the nature of the entertainment; but we read of no dinner being at an earlier hour than one o'clock, and no tea or supper at a later hour than six. The nature of the provisions would have to be determined by a Committee; and, in the majority of cases, the Old English fare of roast-beef and plum-pudding and beer was selected. In most instances the beef was both roast and boiled; elsewhere we find the additions, or variations, of mutton, ham, and meat pies. Bread, potatoes, and, in some cases, cheese were supplied. These solids were in large abundance; each diner had as much as he could eat; and, if anything was left, it was variously distributed on the morrow (together with the calico tablecloths) to the aged, the unavoidable absentees, and the large families. The beer question appears to have been a difficulty; in some cases as much as each person liked was allowed at dinner, to which (in at least one instance) was added a present of sixpence from the farmers to each of their men, for after-dinner consumption; after that, every one being left to do exactly as he liked, the question of quantity and moderation being left entirely to themselves. In those cases where a limited quantity of beer was assigned to each diner the highest in our list gives two quarts to each man, one pint and a-half to each woman, and one pint to each boy; the lowest in the list gives one quart to each man, and a pint to each woman and boy. In one instance London porter was also given; and in cider countries that beverage was generally preferred to beer. The writer of a pamphlet* on this subject advocates the giving of unlimited beer, and states how well the system answered at Lilbrook, where "in no single instance was the confidence placed in the labourer abused," because the labourer, when he came to the feast, remembered his baptismal vows and made up his mind to be bound by them. We are not told whether Lilbrook was situated in Utopia or the Isle of Sky; but, although the writer's statement is very pleasing to receive, we much question its general application to facts. For our own part, we would *not* trust a man, on a day of social rejoicing, with the unwonted temptation of unlimited gratis beer, although we would allow him a reasonable quantity.

It is this beer question that has been raised as an objection against harvest festivals by some who doubt the propriety of the experiment, on the ground that when a labourer has a holiday he enjoys it to excess, and also disorders his system for his next day's work. Perhaps, instead of finding fault with the labourer for abusing one holiday, or assuming, which is, unhappily, not the case, that his is the only class which commits excess, we might perceive the fault to lie in the system that did not give him enough holiday. If it were not for the absolute rarity of such a holiday the labourer might not be tempted to indulge to excess,

* *The Harvest Festival at Lilbrook.* Masters, 1861.

as though the whole happiness of the occasion depended on his pushing a good thing too far. It is to regulate his holiday, in order that it may not degenerate into licentiousness, that the introduction of harvest festivals appear to be so desirable; and the obstacles that lie in the way seem not difficult to be surmounted, provided that the farmers can be induced to join in the work.

In such a case one great stimulant is the breeches-pocket argument. If you can clearly show a farmer or any other employer of labour that he will not only save trouble, but money, in allowing his men to join the parochial festival, his consent will almost invariably follow as a matter of course. No doubt there are many praiseworthy exceptions; but, as a class, employers stand aloof from the "harvest festivals," and if they do not actually prefer the old-fashioned "Harvest-home" to which they have been accustomed, they condone the matter by a five-shilling gift. Now, in one case that is before us, the cost of tea, pipes, and beer, and various sports, came to as low as fivepence a-head for 300 people; and, in all the other cases, where a dinner had to be provided, the total cost per head was, in the highest instance, 2s. 7d.; in the lowest, 1s. 8d.; the average of upwards of fifty cases being 2s. 3d. per head. Thus, a farmer who has been accustomed to give 5s. to each man instead of a dinner, might, if he chose, be a considerable saver by the harvest festival, whether as subscriber to a general fund, or as purchasing, according to a scale to be locally determined, a sufficient number of tickets for himself, his family, house servants, and labourers. The general subscription is the best, because it provides for all the parishioners, men, women, and children; and this without exception or reserve, for a harvest-home day should always be a day of general amnesty. The extra expenses would be for such items as a band of music, bell-ringing, prizes for sports, setting up tables, marquee, &c.; but these items must greatly vary in different places. Thus, at Patshull, Lord Dartmouth supplied the three marquees and the brass band, and, by various other gifts, considerably diminished the expenses. In many other cases, the farmers lend their rick-cloths, which make excellent tents for the dinner, &c.; and, in a few cases the school-room has been used for the dinner or tea. In one parish a subscription, limited to five shillings, was more than sufficient to defray all the extra items of band and prizes; in a second parish ten shillings was the maximum subscription. In those cases (and, happily, they are not rare) where the squire of a parish comes forward and takes the lead both in the labours and the expense, the financial prospects of a harvest festival are most encouraging; and even in those instances where, from the poverty of the neighbourhood, the expense of the extra items has to fall upon the shoulders of the parson and his churchwardens, the sacrifice of the band of music will reduce the cost to no very large sum. But what would a Harvest-home be without a band? One country clergyman records that he found all the extras out of his own pocket for an assembly of nearly 300 parishioners, and that the sum-total only amounted to thirty shillings. At any rate, it is satisfactorily proved that harvest festivals are not

costly; and the labour that their preparation calls for is but slight, and, even if it were large, would be a labour of love; for, surely, it is a privilege to be allowed to assist in providing such a day of innocent amusement as rarely falls to the lot of the day-labourer.

The sports on such occasions have been flat races, hurdle races, blindfold races, sack races, bell jingling, pole swarming, apple throwing, football, &c. In some cases the enjoyment has been heightened by the guests being allowed to walk through the squire's flower-gardens. Dancing has been the chief sport of the evening. Speeches and addresses have also been included in the list of "amusements," but these should be brief. In some cases an exhibition of fireworks, and in other cases of the magic-lantern has brought the sports to an end, the National Anthem being the signal for dismissal. In one case a concert in the schoolroom terminated the day's rejoicing.

These hints, deduced from a great variety of cases, may be useful to those of our readers, whether lay or clerical, who may be interested in the subject of harvest festivals, and desirous to introduce them into their respective neighbourhoods, to replace the revels that have so long enjoyed a questionable reputation under the name of Harvest-homes.

The New Dogma.



OUR difficulty in dealing with the New Dogma of the National Society's Committee is not to expose its mischievous absurdity, but to bring Churchmen to believe that anything so monstrous is actually attempted. That schools which desire it should be allowed to admit Dissenters to secular instruction, without submitting to the Church teaching, is one thing. That point is settled, and we have declared our intention not to contest it. But that schools which refuse this licence should, for that reason only, be put out of the pale of the Society, and even declared to be violating the law of the Church, is certainly another thing. When this paradox is propounded in the name of a Society comprehending nearly all the clergy, and governed officially by the bench of bishops, men may well be excused for suspecting there must be some mistake. The idea is too preposterous; and so the mischief is rooted and growing up before we have opened our eyes to its introduction. In this respect, then, we are obliged to Mr. Lonsdale for his recent letters to Mr. Trevor and Mr. Boothby. Both his correspondents evidently disbelieved what they had heard from others, but now they know it is no mistake. The Committee has pledged itself to this great wrong, and was never (the secretary says) more unanimous. It only remains for the subscribers to say how far they shall be permitted to carry it. *Already another step is talked of, by which the entire results of the battle fought with the Privy Council from 1840 to 1860 are to be given up.* We undertake to make this clear to every reader.

On the 3rd July, 1860, a Memorandum was presented to the Lord President by the late Archbishop

of Canterbury, at the head of a deputation from the National Society, in which the whole controversy on the management clauses was reviewed up to that date. "My lords" were reminded that, "by all the clauses as originally framed and as finally settled, first, the instruction of the children not alone in the Holy Scriptures, but also in the formularies, and particularly the Catechism, of the established Church; secondly, the Church membership of the school managers; and thirdly, union with the National Society, were insured by express declarations." It was added that, "notwithstanding these provisions, many members of the Society regarded the imposition of management clauses by the Committee of Council as a dangerous precedent, and alleged that other clauses *less favourable to unrestricted religious teaching* might ultimately be insisted on." For that reason the National Society had only consented to *recommend* one or other of such clauses, "assured as they were that if the adoption of the clauses should be made an actual condition of their grants, such a *violation of the principle of local freedom* would weaken the authority of the Society and retard the object they were desirous to encourage."*

This was the language of our Committee, only two years ago, against the innovations of the Council Office. They were then all for the Church formularies and local freedom. How is it that we find ourselves now contending for those very objects, not against my lords, but against themselves? Perhaps we do not know all that passed at the interview when this Memorandum was delivered in. It appears that things are said and suggested on such occasions of which there is no record, but which are not without their effect. At all events, the Committee of Council withdrew for the moment the particular form of inquiry against which these remarks were directed, taking occasion, however, to observe that "a bare announcement of union with the National Society leaves it *quite uncertain in practice* whether instruction in the Catechism and Liturgy will, or will not, be compulsorily enforced as a condition of admitting children to the other benefits of the school."† At that time, then, there was clearly no rule *against* such a requirement. This defect the Committee of the National Society took upon themselves to remove. In another Memorandum, dated 23rd of the same month, occurs the following "unostentatious" paragraph. "The answer that every child shall be taught the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy is also *incompatible with union, as depriving the managers of that discretion which the terms of union permit, and which has been extensively and advantageously exercised.*"‡ Now, what did this mean? The terms of union recognize no "discretion" whatever: the word does not occur in them all. But in the Memorandum of the 5th of July it was observed that the admission of Nonconformists to share in the public grants had been attended with the advantage of giving the promoters of Church schools "additional security for the free exercise of their discretion in framing their own trust-deeds, as well as in conducting the religious education of the scholars."§ That is,

plainly, that Dissenters being enabled to get grants of their own, Churchmen were at liberty to insist on a stricter enforcement of the religious requisitions in their national schools. This right had been even acknowledged by the Committee of Council, who had replied to the complaints of some Dissenters that "a large body of the clergy consider themselves to be under an obligation of conscience to make this requirement," that schools so constituted had always enjoyed the grants, and that, to insist on a condition to the contrary, "would at once exclude Church of England schools, or at least the majority of them, from the advantages to be *derived* from the Minutes of Council."*

This was at that time the view of both Committees as to the discretion of founders and managers; it was a discretion to insist on further provisions (if they thought fit), beyond the mere terms of union, to ensure the Church teaching to every child in their school. The sense—if one can call it *sense*—in which the same word was used three weeks later was exactly the reverse. Mr. Lonsdale has explained it again and again to mean a discretion to omit the Church teaching altogether; and this privilege is so essential that it must not be controlled by the founders themselves, but must remain in the managers for the time being, or the school is excluded from union with the National Society!

Whether this new dogma was actually suggested by the Council Office or not we cannot tell; but my lords soon showed they knew how to use it. In the very next month the Colchester School Committee, supported by a meeting of subscribers, proceeded to exercise the discretion claimed in the earlier Memorandum by resolving that no child should be admitted to their school without a certificate of baptism or of reception into the Church. It was admitted that ample means of education for other children existed in the British and Ragged schools of the place, and that this regulation was only the assertion of a principle already existing in the constitution of the Church school; but Mr. Lingen was in possession of the second Memorandum to nullify the first. "The Committee of the National Society," he writes, in a recent letter dated the 23rd ult., "has formally notified to the Committee of Council that it is incompatible with the terms of union to declare beforehand that every child shall be taught the Catechism," &c. &c.; and again, on the 27th of September, "This is more than the terms of union with the National Society, *as expounded authoritatively in the name of that Society*, permit to be announced as an absolute rule," and the regulation was disallowed accordingly. Can we blame the Committee of Council? So long as the National Society was true to itself they respected its rules: they respected "the obligation of conscience to make this requirement;" and they resisted the applications of Dissenters for a condition "which might at once exclude Church schools, or at least the majority of them," from the grants at their disposal. But when the Committee of the National Society had "formally notified" its new dogma, it was not to be expected that the dispensers of the public money would allow "the supposed requirements of religious instruction to be pushed beyond

* National Society's Report, 1861, Appendix, pp. xl. xli.

† Ibid. p. xlviii.

‡ Ibid. p. xlvii.

§ Ibid. p. xxxix.

* National Society's Report, 1861, Appendix, p. xl.

the terms of union," by an "interpretation declared by the Committee of that Society to be inadmissible." Clearly, then, it was the new dogma which gave my lords the occasion for those further restrictions on Church schools of which we are all complaining.

The unexpected difficulty sent the Colchester Committee to the National Society's Office for an explanation, and Mr. Lonsdale's reply introduced a new modification of the gloss. At its first appearance its restriction was laid upon *founders*, on pretence of maintaining the discretion of *managers*. But at Colchester the managers were themselves the parties imposing the regulation, and it became necessary to transfer their "discretion" to another quarter. The subscribers were agreed with the managers, so the clergyman was fixed upon; but the clergyman was of the same mind with the managers and the subscribers; hence it was resolved that the terms of union—those elastic terms again!—"enable the same clergyman or successive clergymen of the same parish to make alterations in the practice of the same school." (Letter V., Dec. 1860.) Then, with the Committee's usual *tour de force*, the enabling clause was converted into a *disabling* one. The clergyman *in esse* was postponed to the clergyman *in posse*, and the new dogma came out complete, that "to require, by the trust-deed, that the parochial clergyman shall give definite religious instruction to every child is to deprive him of that authority in the teaching of his people with which he is entrusted *by the law of the Church (!)*, and which was intended to be preserved to him by the terms of union."

This then, and this alone, is the point now in dispute. The Committee are unscrupulous enough to declare, in their last Minute, that the object of Mr. Mayow's amendment was to impose restrictions on the discretion of the clergyman. Mr. Lonsdale, in yet bolder and more extravagant terms, asserts it is "that and nothing else;" its promoters are seeking, "by a side wind, to alter the terms of union." He well knows that this is exactly what his own Committee is doing, and what it is our object to prevent. We ask for no clause or interpretation whatever; we only desire to withdraw the new dogma volunteered by the Committee, and leave the terms of union to the unfettered discretion of the proper authorities.

The interference of the London Committee is itself a gross violation of the terms of union. They provide that "in case any difference shall arise between the parochial clergy and the managers of the schools, with reference to the preceding rules respecting the religious instruction of scholars, or any regulation connected therewith, an appeal is to be made to the bishop of the diocese, whose decision is to be final."

Till a difficulty arises the clergy and managers are free to act as they think proper. When they disagree the bishop is to decide. In no case has the London Committee any authority whatever over the internal regulations of any national school. We need not say they have no authority to expound the laws of the Church. Yet this they have taken upon themselves to do; and their dogma is enforced by the Committee of Council as an

"authoritative exposition,"—in short, a new term of union overruling all the rest. This is the true state of the case, and Mr. Lonsdale's balderdash about the age of the children and their capacity to learn the Catechism is simply a poor attempt to throw dust in our eyes. Nothing of the kind has ever come into discussion.

The subscribers must not think that the new dogma, bad as it is, is *all* they have to apprehend. It appears, by a correspondence printed in the annual Report just issued, that a further innovation is already in contemplation. The Committee of Council are not satisfied with the victory they have won. Another of those dangerous interviews with the Lord President was held on the 5th of April last, at which it was complained that though the discretion of school founders had been taken away, and that of managers abridged, "there was still nothing to FORBID a regulation" (where *all* parties, we suppose, are determined upon it) to enforce the Church Catechism. The screw must receive another turn, and a *member of the deputation*, the RIGHT HON. H. S. WALPOLE, promptly offered the "*judicious suggestion that some rule should be devised to prevent these cases of injustice !*" This little incident was characteristically omitted from Mr. Lonsdale's "record" of the interview, and from the Committee's Report read at the public meeting; but it will be found duly chronicled and pressed upon "the serious consideration" of the National Society's Committee in Mr. Lingen's Letter of the 16th of April, printed in the Appendix to the Report, page xxxiv. And now, if the subscribers do not open their eyes in time and insist on the withdrawal of the new dogma, and the abandonment of all attempts on the part of their Committee to tamper with the terms of union in any direction, it will not be for want of being warned of the treason in progress. Mr. Lonsdale agrees with Mr. Trevor that the question is "fundamental." He writes to Mr. Boothby that "it is better the Society should cease to exist" than maintain its terms of union as universally interpreted up to the 23rd of July, 1860. We accept his expression, and deliberately record our conviction that the Society had far better be dissolved, and leave our schools to maintain their own case with the Government, than exist only to cut away the ground from under our feet by successive surrenders of reason and principle to the demands of the Council Office.

Church Schools, the "Conscience Clause," and the Charity Commissioners.



THE following statement will help to illustrate the present legal position of the schools of the Church of England in relation to the department of Government which dispenses the "Education Grant," and to the "Charity Commissioners."

In the year 1837, a large landed proprietor, since deceased, gave a plot of ground, in the district of Moulsham, in trust to the Rector and Churchwardens of Chelmsford (the mother parish) for the

purpose—as stated in the trust-deed—of erecting school buildings “in order to promote the education of poor children in the principles of true religion and useful knowledge.”

The site immediately adjoined that of the district church of Moulsham, erected in the same year, 1837, and was occupied, until the autumn of 1860, by an infant schoolroom in connection with the Chelmsford Church Schools, erected by and under the superintendence of the clergyman. This building was then pulled down in order to make room for more commodious church schools, and three large rooms were finished and opened in July 1861.

At the proper time application for a grant in aid of the Building Fund had been made to the Committee of Privy Council for Education. The question of the admission of the Conscience Clause into the trust-deed was at first raised by that Committee, but was waived on being answered by a decided negative.

As, however, the site was part of a charity estate, the Committee of Council required the sanction of the Charity Commissioners to a new deed of trust, and this the Commissioners positively refused unless the Conscience Clause was inserted. They grounded their decision upon the vagueness of the original deed, and refused to admit any evidence as to the intentions of the donor, laying down as an invariable principle that, “according to a cardinal rule of legal construction, the objects of a trust must be collected solely from the terms of the instrument itself.”

Feeling that, in acceding to this requirement, they would be acting plainly contrary to the wishes and intentions of the donor of the site, as well as to the purposes for which the building funds were subscribed, the promoters of the schools took the only course which was open to them, and appealed to the Court of Chancery. Vice-Chancellor Kindersley decided* that *the religious opinion of the founder could be given in evidence in order to explain the object of the trust* (Attorney General v. Calvert 23, Beavan 248), and as that conclusively showed the intentions of the donor, he rejected the Conscience Clause.

Eastern Asia.

 HE first Napoleon, when asked whether he had aspired from the outset to the pinnacle of ambition, which he afterwards reached, replied, “No—but each success brought others into view.” This is always the case, with states as well as with individuals. Not seldom has the fate of an expedition, upon which hinged the future fortunes of a kingdom or half a continent, depended upon a trifling success or reverse at the outset. The expedition may not be recognized as of importance by its framers: only to the eyes of posterity does its beginning appear as the “little cloud no bigger than a man’s hand,” which was soon to overcast the whole horizon. Thus it is that men and nations at times become unexpectedly great; thus it is also that they sometimes fall, through inadvertence and want of calculation, into very embarrassing mistakes.

Our Indian empire is one of the brilliant miscalculations which figure in history. When our traders first landed in India the Great Mogul was at the very pinnacle of his splendour, power, and renown. The England of that time would have been matched, both in wealth and in resources, by a single province of his empire. We never dreamt of contending with such a potentate. We petitioned him for some commercial favours, and were humbly grateful for the few that we received. And yet, in due time, we overthrew that potentate, and now reign over an empire greater and more consolidated than ever before was seen between the Himalayas and the sea. Had any one, a hundred years ago, on receiving tidings of the battle of Plassy, predicted that our success would involve us in a ceaseless advance, and ceaseless wars, and that in truth, for good or for evil, we had now embarked in an enterprise in which, if success was doubtful, retreat at least was impracticable, he would have been an object of great ridicule. Not so now. The public has become so familiarised with great exploits, so penetrated with a conviction of the immense superiority of Europeans, and especially the British, to all other races on the face of the earth, that enterprises from which our ancestors would have shrunk appalled are now-a-days deemed as good as won from the outset. We will dare anything: from Arctic voyages, Alpine climbing, and scientific balloon ascents, to the facing and quelling of a Sepoy revolt, Englishmen have shown that all that men may dare they will dare. And if we consult the general public—the *οἱ πολλοί* who rejoice in a merely commercial education—we shall probably find that their ideas of what England can do in foreign parts are at least as large as they are hazy. Walking down Fleet Street in the autumn of '59, when the news of our naval disaster at the mouth of the Peiho came home, we heard two city men, who preceded us in that crowded thoroughfare, discussing the matter; till the one said, “And what must we do with China now?” “Oh, we’ll annex it, of course,” said the other. The reply might have been excellent, if ironical; but the individuals who stopped our way evidently piqued themselves upon their business-like appreciation of the “position.”

Annex China! Take four hundred millions of people—at least one-third of the whole human race—into our keeping! Certainly, as the Yankees say, we are a great nation; but there may be some things too great even for us. There are only thirty millions of us altogether, and not to speak of the vast geographical area over which our rule extends, our Indian empire alone makes us masters of nearly two-hundred millions of a perfect alien race. Our statesmen feel that we have already got fully more on our hands than we can well manage; and the last desire of any sensible man of our day would be to wish to see new countries and more alien races subjected to our sway. But were there not sensible men a hundred years ago who thought as the sensible men do now?—and yet from that day to this the history of England has been a narrative of ceaseless growth and expansion—an overflowing into other countries, an overlaying of other and inferior races. And, it may be said,

* Monday, August 4, 1862.

since that has been the case hitherto, why should the case not continue the same now? Is not our power increased a thousandfold? Do we not cover the seas with our ships, and cannot we transport an army to the antipodes as easily as in former times a single regiment? And has not our power in war, both actually and relatively, been augmented to an extraordinary degree in recent times? A century ago the troops of any single province of the Grand Mogul's empire were a match for the force which we could bring against them. But Time, who has been standing still in the East, has been achieving wonders in the West. We now march to Peking as if it was a manœuvre of parade; we could land an army on the coast of China which could scatter the whole military forces of the enormous Celestial Empire like sheep; which could march through the country from end to end, from Canton to Peking, without experiencing any formidable difficulty; while our gunboats for the greater part of the year could ascend the Yang-tse-kiang for six hundred miles, into the heart and through the garden-land of China. If, then, we could do all this—and if, too, as we believe, the world, despite Dr. Cumming, is likely to live a good while longer, what is preposterous in the idea that we may now be witnessing the first steps in a chain of events which in due time will involve us as deeply with China as we now are involved with India? If we begun to annex the empire of the Moguls a century ago, why may we not begin to annex the empire of the Brother of the Sun and Moon now?

To the philosopher in his closet, pondering all things in a vague misty way, this idea may seem less absurd than assuredly it will do to practical men. In such matters it is a question not of power, but of cost, which determines the issue. Although, even were it a mere question of power, we opine that a statesman would not throw out of account the growing might of Russia in Eastern Asia, and the certainty that if ever the native dynasty of the Sun and Moon sets or suffers eclipse, the Muscovite Bear will assert his claim to no small portion of the spoil. Indeed, however opposite may be the case in India, we believe that the military power of Russia, and her means of influencing the native population, will ere long greatly excel ours in China. It would be a sad triumph of civilization if the chief result of its progress in the Celestial Empire were to bring into bloody conflict the Powers from whose peaceful and beneficent influence the vast population of China ought to profit so much. Surely the coming of Christianity and civilization into the vast empire of Eastern Asia ought to be attended by very different results.

Let us trust they will be—if not for religion's sake, at least from a due attendance to the dictates of self-interest. We have at present to bear an extraordinary load of taxation at home. The exigencies of the position in Europe are such that every State has from necessity to arm itself to the teeth: and unambitious as is our policy, and happily insulated as we are from the troubles of the Continent by geographical position, we have nevertheless found it indispensable to girdle the isle with fortifications, to expend enormous sums upon our fleet, and to supplement the numerical inadequacy of our

army by appealing to the military patriotism of the people. Cheerfully as the nation bears the burden, it is so heavy that we have to take serious note of it. Unconsciously to ourselves, perhaps, it has begun to operate in a very marked manner in affecting our judgment in some of the most important questions of policy. Scrutinizing every item of the national expenditure, with a strong desire to force ends to meet with less difficulty than at present, we have begun to look with a severely jealous and grudging eye at the few hundred thousand pounds which we have yearly to pay to keep up our colonial empire: and, in our financial strait, we have begun to ask whether, after all, it is of any importance to us to have colonies or not? Colonies, however indirectly advantageous, necessitate a positive outlay; why, then, in these days of free trade, should we not cast them off altogether, to form what connections they please, and content ourselves with an empire no bigger than our own very small islands?

When we grudge the small cost of our colonies, we are not likely to be in a humour for prosecuting further annexations, or disbursing money for wars waged needlessly in the uttermost corners of the earth. "China wars" have already become the terror of every economist, and the opprobrium of every sensible politician. We have already had three China wars in less than twenty years; each of them has cost the country a deal of money; and if they have not each and all been immoral, this at least is certain, that there is not one of them to which we can look back with pride, or speak of in any language save that of apology. And not the least embarrassing thing of these China wars is that we slip into them so easily. The country seems to become involved in them whether we like or not. Indeed hostilities have generally commenced before the country knows anything about the matter.

We fear that England is getting into this embarrassment again. Our Government, which hitherto has been so eager to fight with the Imperial Government of China, now tries another tack; and, as if the "treachery and barbarism" of the Chinese Government had become a somewhat stale plea for hostilities, it now finds an excuse for further meddling in the still greater barbarism of the rebels. It is universally agreed that the shake which our former wars gave to the power and prestige of the Chinese Government was one of the prime causes or auxiliaries of the grand rebellion which now tortures and devastates the flowery land. Yet in this very rebellion we find a fresh excuse for further intervention. We now aid the Government, and attack the rebels. Our plea for hostilities, indeed, is plausible enough. In virtue of a treaty concluded with the Imperial Government we are entitled to trade at several ports on the coast of China; and one of these at least has been menaced by the rebel forces. This would explain our manning the ramparts of Shanghai, and giving any rebel force, which ventured to attack the city, a lesson in the efficiency of Enfield rifles and Armstrong guns. But a further explanation is necessary to understand why we should have abandoned the defensive, and marched inland to attack the rebels in conjunction with the Imperial army. It is a part, and a chief part, of the tactics

of the rebels, when they besiege a city, to lay waste the country for miles around; so that the city itself dies of atrophy, and, if not stormed by the rebels, is abandoned as untenable by its dependents. This is precisely the same tactics as the early Turkish armies employed in Asia Minor: as their own commissariat marched on four legs, they desolated the country around all the chief towns,—at once depriving the towns of sustenance, and converting the country into a vast pasture-land for their own herds and flocks.

When such are the tactics of the rebels in China, it becomes obvious that we must either be content to be starved out in Shanghai, or keep the rebels at a distance. This would be a grievous embarrassment in any case; but, by the natural downward tendency of things, we have gone further. We have regularly allied ourselves with the Chinese Government, and have gone to open war with the rebels. We have placed some of our officers under the orders of the Chinese Government, and an order in council has just been issued allowing our officers to take service under the Emperor of China. This, in our opinion, is the small beginning of great events. And when our finances are so burdened at home we have no desire to see "great events" in the East; especially when they menace us not only with additional expenditure for the present, but with greatly augmented embarrassments and responsibility for the future.

Mr. Steuart.



WARNINGS are useful things under two conditions. They must be intelligible, and they must come from weighty men. Failing both, or either of, these conditions, they are ludicrous. But ludicrous though they be, they do mischief, because there are always people ready to be imposed upon by any assumption of oracular wisdom.

Churchmen have just had a warning from Mr. Steuart upon the occasion of his retiring from the representation of Cambridge borough. We will examine the warning presently when we have examined the man.

Mr. Steuart is one of a lately-discovered tribe, the unhealthy spawn of the Reform Bill. He is a "Liberal Conservative." Now this conjunction of terms is either unnecessary or it is untrue. Every "Conservative" is a "Liberal" in the true sense of the word. If "Liberal" in any other sense, he is not "Conservative." It is, however, not difficult to understand, by the teaching of sundry examples, what the conjunction means. It means a man who is either morally deficient, as having no fixed principles of policy, or intellectually deficient, as being unable to distinguish between a principle and a detail, or between the facts of one period of a nation's history and the facts of another. There are some such men in Parliament. They claim to be, and are taken to be, defenders of the institutions of the country because they sit on the same side of the House with those who do defend them; but they are found out directly they are asked to give

an institution up. Then it is seen that the "Conservatism" of the men is negative, their want of faith positive, and, as is invariably the case with men of this character, their moral cowardice great.

It is from one of these men that Churchmen have had a warning. He is not a weighty man. But if he were, is his warning intelligible?

What is the warning as it is put? I warn you against the formation of a Church party in Parliament. This is the advice of this Conservative man. What does it mean? Why should there not be a Church party in Parliament? Why should there not be a Church party in Parliament rather than any other party? Is there any other basis of party so good? Is there any other solid and sure basis of party at all? Is not the very reason why the Conservatives have been so weak that they have overlooked this fact? Is not the very reason why they are becoming strong that they have lately recognized it? What does Mr. Steuart mean? Are other institutions of the country to be defended and maintained, and is the National Church not to be defended and maintained? And how is any institution to be maintained except by party? Mr. Steuart is surely not weak enough to suppose that England is going to be governed in any other way. Why, the feebleness of Governments of late—which all sensible men deplore—has arisen out of this very fact, that, in the last thirty years, parties have been dislocated, and in some respects dissolved; and that they require to be reconstructed before it shall be possible for us to see once more anything like a strong and steady Government; one which does not live from hand to mouth, but has its own principles and its own practice. Party, as we have pointed out before, means disciplined organization for the upholding and maintaining of certain principles. Does Mr. Steuart want us to have no principles? In that case we certainly can have no party. But Englishmen have a prejudice in favour of principles, and, first of all, in favour of that which is the basis of all sound public principle amongst us, the principle of the national Church; and whatever Mr. Steuart, or five hundred Mr. Steuarts, may say, they will have party.

We will suggest to Mr. Steuart what he ought to have borne in mind before he set about warning giving, but which it is plain that he has wholly overlooked. It is defence, not intolerant domination, much less aggression, for which Churchmen are drawing together as a party in and out of Parliament. It is to preserve those specific things without which the National Church cannot discharge her office, and her duties to the people at large, not to deprive any class or individual of her Majesty's subjects of a single civil or religious right or privilege, that Churchmen are combining in and out of Parliament. If the case had been otherwise, Mr. Steuart's warning would have been wise and right. But, with the case as it is, Mr. Steuart's warning is wrong and foolish. Dissenters in England have no grievances now. They may pretend to have, and make political capital and hustings machinery out of the pretence, but it is only to make wise men lament that the name of religion and the sanctities of the religious life should be so prostituted and defiled.

We should not have thought it worth while to notice Mr. Steuart, had it not been for the fact that there is a good deal of mawkish nonsense and political unhealthiness in the country of which he has made himself the expositor. The want of party—that is, of principle—in political life has acted unfavourably upon the national character; and many more of us have learnt to play fast and loose with principles than we used to do. Happily, however, we are beginning to see the error of our ways; and the first fruit of our better mind is that we are drawing together as a party for the defence of the National Church in and out of Parliament. With Mr. Steuart's leave we shall continue this process.

Mr. Coleridge and the "Liberals" of Exeter.

 R. COLERIDGE is a curiosity. Not the first of the class, but an unusually fine specimen. His present phase should be photographed as well as an appearance so misty will permit; and we will try our hand, though we are really modest enough to have some doubt as to our capacity.

The "Liberals" of Exeter, being in a difficulty, have made a new flag, and have expended upon the work such resources of skill and capital as are at their command. It is large and handsome; a white ground, emblematic of purity, with a good deal of lettering on both sides—red on one, black on the other. Its only defect is, that, being rather of a flimsy and transparent texture, when it is held up to the light the lettering on the two sides runs together and rather confuses the eyes and the understanding.

On the red side—Church and Queen—All the Coleridges—Bishop of Exeter—Church-rate: No Surrender—Catholic and Apostolic Church—Tractarianism: Dr. Pusey for Ever. On the black—A Bloated Aristocracy—John Duke Coleridge—Radical Reform—Black Bartholomew—Grievances of Conscience—Ballot—Universal Suffrage—*Vox populi Vox Dei*—Bishop of London—Down with the Priests.

Under this flag Mr. Coleridge marches into Exeter and makes a speech.

The speech is like the flag, very plain to understand as long as you look only on one side of it: very confusing when the eye of the mind takes in both sides.

But a little mystification of constituents at their own hand, and at the hand of the man of their choice, is so common a thing at the outset of a parliamentary connection that it requires no notice. Besides, it leaves more room for those delightful reunions of members and constituents, at which explanations are asked and given. This is all, therefore, after the usual course on such occasions; only it is, as will have appeared from the flag, a very remarkable instance of the extent to which such things may prosperously attain. It may, however, be worth a little consideration what the state of things will be in the capital of the West when this fine flag has gone up and down the streets at an election or two, sup-

posing Mr. Coleridge to succeed in the object of his present great ambition.

The Liberals are angling with a respected name and its Churchmanship. The name and the Churchman are angling with the best Liberal baits. We are not for a moment saying that there is any insincerity anywhere. We never cast imputations. We only take facts. For Mr. Coleridge we have the highest personal regard and respect. If we were acquainted with the "Liberals" of Exeter—which it is our misfortune not to be—we should doubtless have regard and respect for them. All we say is, that here is a conjunction which our plain and, perhaps, obtuse understanding, having for many years considered it under its few known instances, is not competent to grasp. And we have a fear, not unnatural nor unkindly, that it will be found to break down sooner or later, to the great disappointment of both parties, and not without some considerable damage to personal character:

We are not wanting in a just respect for ourselves, but we are not so conceited as to suppose that our advice will be taken in this matter. Mr. Coleridge and the Exeter "Liberals" have, we know, carefully and deeply considered what they are about, and have ascertained to their entire satisfaction that harmony between black and red which we are unable with our best and most sincere endeavours to detect. Nevertheless, as we have no liking for seeing honourable men on either side in the false positions which in our humble judgment are inseparable from the case, we would respectfully ask the "Liberals" of Exeter what they propose to get by the bargain. A gentleman? granted. A Churchman? granted. A scholar, and a ripe one? granted. An eminent and rising lawyer? granted. A kind neighbour and friend in more intimate connection? granted. But there is another question: What do they think they are going to get for the "Liberal" cause?

Now many of the letterings in black may be dismissed as what is called conventional—just so much electioneering talk—as having no existence when the hustings are taken down; or, if they have in the minds of the "Liberals" of the West, as having no proper parliamentary being. The excesses of aristocratic power in England are a myth. Radical Reform is a myth. Black Bartholomew is a folly that is past. Universal Suffrage is an absurdity. Grievances of the Dissenting Conscience are an untruth. About the Ballot Mr. Coleridge has spoken with a frankness that leaves nothing to be desired. But we thought he had been more of a statesman than to vote for a great change which he knows cannot be; and which, if it could, he believes would have no profitable effect. We do not know that he has any particular predilection for the Bishop of London; and we never heard him cry *Vox populi Vox Dei*, or "down with the priests;" and if we had, it would not do him much good in the House of Commons.

But the letterings in red. Mr. Coleridge's *proprium*—let us say it *pace tanti viri*—these are great facts. Facts which it will take a good many more "Liberals" than there are in Exeter, or indeed in England, to annul or to discredit. The bargain then, we submit, is not an equal one, and the

inequality will engender discontent in minds now so beautifully harmonious. It will be an odd day for the Exeter "Liberals" when they discover—as they certainly will—that red is everywhere and black nowhere. We hope it will be no less gratifying, but of this we cannot be so satisfied. Neither do we prognosticate whether the issue will be pleasing or not to Mr. Coleridge in later years. We have our opinion upon this, but we do not state it.

Meantime we are constrained to say that there is something lowering in an eminent lawyer bowing himself to plead excuse before a "Liberal" constituency for having been retained in the "High Church" side; and something very like immorality in a Churchman advocating great constitutional changes which are either impossible or useless. If the Churchmanship be real it must, after all, be the substance of the life, and it will in the end, if not tampered with too heavily, put the Radicalism out of court. Mr. Coleridge may be one of those Churchmen who have no faith in Church and State. We do not know, but it looks very like it. If a man means his radical principles to be carried out in the action of a political system, *this* is incompatible with the permanent existence of a National Church. If he does not mean them to be so carried out, to advocate them is only to delude himself and his supporters. We submit this dilemma to the legal acumen and to the honourable mind of Mr. Coleridge. We submit it also to the careful consideration of the "Liberals" of Exeter.

National Catholicity.



ONE of the most perplexing incidents to the Church historian of the nineteenth century will be the secession of a considerable number of so-called High-Churchmen to the Papal communion. Whigs, Latitudinarians, and Low-Churchmen attribute it to the natural tendency of such tenets as Apostolical succession, Sacramental grace, and Church authority; but the historian, whatever his individual bias, cannot altogether shut his eyes to fact and reasoning. No Englishman, certainly, will submit his religion to the yoke of a foreign see so long as he believes the highest Church privileges to be attainable in his own National communion; and, in point of fact, it is that belief which has secured to the Church of England a stability and influence never reached by any of the continental Protestants. In this country the Reformation was happily effected without any disorganization of Church or State, and without any vital disruption of their mutual relations. The Royal Supremacy was based on the assertion that every grace inherent in the Christian Church was fully inherited by the English spirituality. The vindication of that assertion by our own Hooker extorted from Pope Clement VIII. the well-known confession, that, "if the rest be like this, they shall last till the last fire shall consume all learning." Its triumphant elaboration by our divines of the seventeenth century created the only body of theology which Rome really feels to be formidable. It is the same belief tenaciously cherished in the East, which, in spite of many obvious defects, has all along maintained the Oriental Churches against the superior learning and influence of the Papacy. The knowledge of these facts has led accordingly to another and very different explanation of the losses we lately had to deplore. It was argued that our perverts were not High-Churchmen enough; that they had been educated, in fact, in the opposite school, and only took up with Anglican views for a time when already on the re-

coil from the low shallow notions which had disturbed and repelled their deeper convictions. Having been early taught to associate the graces of Churchmanship with the Papal Supremacy they could not realize them in a National communion, and so naturally fell away to Rome for a fuller development. In many cases this explanation was true enough; but as the movement proceeded it was found inapplicable to many others; and the historian will have to seek a deeper and more general law for the phenomenon.

Now we think the problem may be solved from a due consideration of the principles to the assertion of which this Journal is devoted. All the great English divines were firm supporters of the union of CHURCH AND STATE; it was in their eyes the ordinance of GOD not of man. *The seceders of the nineteenth century will be found to have been one and all unsound upon this vital point from the beginning.* This was distinctively the vice of their age. The Church was regarded by them (as by most of the leading men of the day) as a speculation more than a fact; while others ignored it altogether, they could only look at it in what we have before called a *transcendental point of view*. It was the Church of their books, or of their imagination, not the Church of their fathers, which engrossed their allegiance; and when the ideal clashed with the actual, they went off to Rome in quest of a more satisfactory reconciliation. Everyone who remembers the line of argument adopted, both in public and in private, by the gifted enthusiasts who reasoned best on the matters in dispute, will bear testimony to the truth of our experience. There was a crowd of followers who could not reason,—boys and girls who thought it fine to be superior to Protestant prejudice; fanatics who had it "borne in upon them" by irresistible conviction that Rome was the seat of all apostolical grace. Still there were men of higher mark, qualified by learning and talent to weigh the several questions in dispute between the two Churches, and, what is most noteworthy, actually coming to the conclusion that England had the best of the argument, who yet suffered the conclusions of reason to be overborne by the paramount claims of the "Catholic Church."

Now we say that what they dignified with this appellation was not any living working Church in the world; but an ideal which probably never existed anywhere, and is certainly (as many proved to their sorrow) no better realized at Rome than in England. The root of their error lay in the habit of looking at the Catholic Church through their private judgment, and from some other position than their own. A man of ordinary common sense connects himself with the human race through his own parents. He is a child of Adam *because* he is born of his own father and mother. The transcendentalist who forgets his family to cultivate a world-wide sympathy with mankind neither benefits his race, nor improves his own heart. This was exactly the fault of our seceders. Instead of cultivating their relations with the Catholic Church through their own mother of the Church of England, they judged their spiritual parent by the sentiments of Greek or Latin fathers, culled at their own pleasure, and applied to their own position and obligations by the merest private judgment in the world. This was a very natural result from the prevalent fashion of denying or disregarding the essential union of Church and State. The Whig statesman conceives a National Church to be any body of religionists which the State selects to endow in return for a large surrender of doctrine and discipline to state policy. The transcendentalist Churchman thinks the Catholic Church condescends to the State in consenting to accept its pay and become the instructor of the nation. Each considers it a bargain between two naturally independent parties; and accordingly each is found at times dissatisfied with the terms. The Whig insolently complains that "bishops forget their maker;" and the transcendentalist whines out a fretful inquiry "how long the Church is to submit to her bondage."

Such language was unknown to our great English statesmen and divines, because they were strangers to the radical mistake from which it flows. They never looked on

Church and State as free agents to unite or separate as they pleased, but as God's ordinances for the spiritual and temporal welfare of this nation. The sovereign, however the prerogative might be modified by human laws, was its "minister of God for good;" and the Church, though gifted with spiritual life from a higher source, was its debtor to make known the unsearchable riches of Christ to every Englishman. Each had the whole nation in trust from God; and each was under an indispensable obligation to help the other in the interests of the whole people. The political requisitions of the State and the temporal privileges of the Church might vary, because they are in their own nature liable to fluctuation; but the union of Church and State can never be dissolved without violating the immediate law of their existence.

The true Anglican Churchman then maintains, in the first place, the Creed, the Sacraments, and the Succession, which are essential to the being of his Church as a branch of the Catholic communion; and next to this, the National trust which determines her place in the world, and binds himself to his duty. He knows of no "voice of Catholicity" but that which is spoken by his own mother; he subordinates the views of individual writers of one age or another to the existing laws of his own National Church; he knows not why the usages of any other people should be better than our own. Using the liberties which Church and State permit to him as churchman and citizen to advocate such improvements as commend themselves to his judgment, he is of necessity loyal to both; because it is in their perfection and union that he recognizes the Divine ordinance for the civilization and salvation of the empire. We venture to say that no one entertaining these convictions will be in danger of perversion to Rome.

Popular Amusements.



It would puzzle a Japanese philosopher, full of curiosity about the institutions of English civilization, to understand the diversity of means adopted to amuse the population of the metropolis; and if this perplexes a stranger, still more difficult of apprehension is it to one of ourselves, living, as is the characteristic of Englishmen, in a condition of comparative domestic or sectional isolation that is particularly unfavourable to a comprehensive acquaintance with the broad field of life beyond our own. But though difficult, it is desirable that we should from time to time extend the scope of our vision into unfamiliar regions of human life, and glance with a critical though kindly eye at the business and the pleasures of classes whose taste and refinement are in inverse proportion to their numbers. The student whose only relaxation is found in the change from one kind of labour to another is separated by a wide gulf alike from those to whom amusement is the principal object of life, and those who diversify active toil with the passive receiving of something to entertain and distract. To him amusement is only compatible with individual activity, and he cannot understand how people can sit still to have amusement, as it were, pumped into them. But it is not fair to measure one class by the standard of education of another, and neither a philosophical nor a friendly view of the thousand varied phases of society can be taken without a genial admission that other men may rightly be not as we are. The spectacle of the huge bills with which every blank wall or boarding in London is covered is not one of unmixed gratification to the thoughtful on-looker, neither are the entertainments which they announce of a kind which educated taste would suggest or judicious refinement enjoy. If we go to the entertainments themselves, it is only a firm determination to abide by the principle that has just been laid down that prevents us from giving way to sentiments of honest disgust. We are not now speaking of the theatres, though in very many of these the class of representation has fallen very low, but of those already

multitudinous and rapidly-increasing establishments whose professed object is to provide amusement for the large numbers, who—since the supply—seem now to demand it. It requires, we repeat, the utmost firmness and perseverance to repress the loathing, for it really amounts to this, which the sight of so many rational beings taking pleasure in such pastimes is calculated to beget. Pseudo-negros with their degrading buffoonery and meaningless speeches; wretched songs, professedly comic or satirical, and the principal source of the senseless slang of the day; and now, most popular of all, dangerous and exciting performances on the trapeze or in some other shape;—such are the pleasures in which the populace of London finds relaxation from the troubles of the day. It is hard to discover anything to be said in favour of these heinous outrages upon all sense and reason; and with every desire to advocate the principle of all men enjoying their leisure precisely as it seemeth them good, we are almost disposed to regret that places so calculated to vitiate and degrade the understandings of those who frequent them should even be tolerated. We fancy, after all, that it is not the entertainment which attracts the audience; that they are not resorted to on account of the singing and buffoonery: but because they are agreeable lounges where the artisan may enjoy his pipe and beer, or the clerk his penny cigar, with a certain amount of garish comfort that is especially welcome to men whose days are passed in dingy offices or squalid factories. Yet even this plea is unavailable for the gymnastic performances, after which all classes alike at the present moment seem to be running mad. These are unquestionably entered into with a hearty gusto transcending all considerations of beer and tobacco; such performances are watched with the most eager interest and the most superlative enjoyment. And unreservedly as we dislike them, utterly improper as they are in our eyes, it is not perhaps difficult to see whence they derive their popularity.

The successful escape from positions of personal danger has invariably and naturally been a ground of popular admiration. We look with awe and respect upon a man who has gone through hair-breadth escapes and moving accidents by flood and field. Respect for the physical courage which dares to expose life to destruction may be considered almost an instinct in the human mind; hence comes the pre-eminence in popularity of military glory over glory of every other kind. It would be a copy-book truism to say that courage of this sort demands far less fine qualities than courage unsurrounded by the pomp and circumstance of glorious war. But these qualities are less calculated to impress the senses of the more thoughtless among mankind; and the man who fearlessly rushes into bodily danger will probably continue to command the love of the mass. And indeed there is something worthy of the most proper and reasonable admiration in physical intrepidity, in the courageous encountering of peril to life or limb. But this admiration is neither proper nor reasonable when it is bestowed without regard to the motive with which such intrepidity is evoked, and such danger undergone. Now in the case of these public gymnasts there is no motive whatever beyond that of making money. It is a prostitution of courage, and at the same time a monstrous waste of human physical power, to employ both one and the other for the sheer gratification of a morbid popular taste.

"Men are become as birds, and skim like swallows—
The surface of the world."

"For what good end?
The end is in itself—the end of skimming
The surface of the world."

For what good end does Blondin become a bird, and perch himself on a rope some scores of feet above the ground? The end is in itself. With that unhappy woman who fell crushed on the earth the other day the end attained was mutilation and permanent disfigurement; and with all of these performers it may probably one day be the same. And this results from the unhealthy direction of a sentiment in itself wholesome enough. We naturally admire courage, because it means that which has endurance and fortitude

for a good cause ; but by degenerations we come to admire it without any reference to its motive or utilisation. It is not uncommon to hear some very strong epithets applied to these gymnastic exhibitions, and they are not a whit too strong. Such exhibitions *are* barbarous and cruel. Only, remembering that most evil is only the fallen form of something that is or has been good, we may justly bear in mind that the prevailing taste for dangerous performances is only the corruption of the same sentiment which creates our admiration for a victorious crew at Henley, or a soldier with half-a-dozen clasps to his medal. Such a corruption is inexcusable in many persons who encourage perilous gymnastics ; everybody of education ought to have learnt that life is too precious to be "butchered to make a Roman holiday." And the fact that this popular love for them is a corruption would almost seem to call for a public prohibition, were it not that more harm than good would ensue from such interference by authority.

The whole range of popular performances at the present moment may be characterized by the American slang-phrase—sensational. Spectators seem to be all inflamed with a kind of feverish excitement for which it is not easy to account. It may be partially explained by saying, that, upon the outbreak of the American disturbances, the rats were the first to leave the sinking ship, and a host of public performers came over to Europe. But this explanation is imperfect, for had there not been a somewhat unhealthy predisposition in the public mind before the arrival of sensational actors and gymnasts, they would never have met with the marvellous success that has attended their exhibitions. The existence of such feverishness, from whatever cause it may arise, must be accounted an evil sign. There is, however, one consideration which must not be overlooked when we are talking about popular amusements, and the excitement which is required to make them generally palatable. It is certainly possible, and a closer examination of facts than we can pretend to enter upon in the limits of an article would show, we believe, that it is extremely probable, that the increase of sensationalism, if we may use the word in such a sense, is rather in its publicity than in its popularity. The establishment of the spacious music-halls in the midst of us has familiarised exhibitions of which, under former circumstances, we should have known little or nothing. It would be a great mistake to suppose that vice is more prevalent now than it was fifty years ago, and yet the publicity given to such vice as there is through the newspapers might lead the incautious reader to suppose that it had increased absolutely. And in like manner with these performances. They are more widely advertised than they were in days of yore, and very probably, bad as they are in point of taste and reason, they are an advance upon the amusements of former generations. The unrefined classes must not be blamed for loving unrefined pleasures, and the practical precept with which the wise man would quit his survey of these pleasures is that the low condition of the popular taste, as evidenced in the attractions placarded over the London walls, should serve as another stimulus to all who are happy enough to possess cultivation to disseminate a measure of it to the less fortunate in proportion to their ability to receive it.

The Way of Unity. (III.)

Bishops Suffragan.



MHEN Scipio would free the soil of Italy from the Carthaginian foe he proposed to transfer the conflict to the shores of Africa. What ! and leave Hannibal in Italy, and invite him to thunder again at the walls of Rome ? Even so : and the plan succeeded, and thenceforth Rome never saw another enemy at her gates so long as Rome was true to herself. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal ; but if we would free our Church from impending dangers, it may be that our course must also be that of spiritual

aggression. Let us maintain Church-rate, let us increase the power of the Church in Parliament, let us do many other things with a view to Church defence. These things are our duty, and we may not neglect our duty. But there is, besides, "a more excellent way." The best and truest defence of the Church would be found to be that which should substitute for the attractions of Dissent some truer and holier love within the Church itself. All this may seem chimerical : and one thing especially is always to be remembered which statesmen seem always to forget, namely, how large a part of the hostility to the Church is connected with what is bad in the world, how easily political hostility to established institutions enlists the co-operation of irreligious people, and how largely the political influence that is brought to bear against the Church is enlisted from those very classes whom it is the avowed object of Churchmen and Dissenters alike to enlighten and convert.

Nevertheless, it is our duty to do what we may, and above all things it seems important that we should seek to do it by such methods as are within our own power. Have we not seen somewhat too often an archbishop or a bishop waiting on the will of parliaments or ministers ?—*magnus mirandusque cliens*. Are there not even yet resources within the Church herself which might go far towards restoring its efficiency under the Divine blessing ? Let but that efficiency be in some measure restored ; let the Dissenting bodies be attracted again towards the Church by the inclinations of their members ; be constrained by love ; and *then* the time will be come for talking and treating of reunion.

And to begin with the highest : it seems to be at length agreed that we want more bishops. But, perhaps, it is hardly even yet acknowledged how great is that want, or how lamentably it hinders and cripples the religious life of the population. It may have been, for instance, a wise course as regards the city of London which was adopted by the late excellent bishop of that see, in refusing to confirm persons under the age of fifteen. But when such a system is extended to the whole country, and when confirmations cannot be held more than once in three years, owing to the paucity of bishops, the practical result is to postpone the age in the case of two-thirds of the population to sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen, and that with this superadded misfortune that persons of these ages will almost always have quitted their homes, and being removed from the eye of their own pastor will be far less likely to present themselves for confirmation at all, even if they have not in the meantime fallen into sinful courses from which the grace of confirmation, and above all of the holy sacrament might, by God's blessing, have saved them. So that the very effort of the few bishops whom we have to improve the system they administer may tend to render it less efficient. This is but one instance of many that might be adduced. Nor is even this the whole of the case. It is essential to the proper working of a parish that the parish priest should always have a class of catechumens who are designed for the next confirmation. As soon as a confirmation is over, the next class should be formed. In this way there would be no interval between school instruction and preparation for the fulness of Christian privileges ; and thus only, humanly speaking, can we hope that young Christians may be trained, in all classes of life, as they now happily are in many families of the more educated classes. But this cannot be without *yearly* confirmations, which under the present lack of bishops is impossible.

But what is the remedy ? Throughout the last century, what was that importunate cry from across the broad Atlantic by which the ears of our English bishops were continually assailed ? It was that they would send over a *suffragan* to help them. When the design of Queen Ann's Government of giving them a diocesan bishop had been frustrated by her death, and when the government of her successors feared to do it lest they should offend the Dissenters, the clergy and Churchmen of the American colonies importuned the bishops to put in execution the existing law by which any one bishop is empowered to

nominate two persons of his own selection to the Crown, and of these the person chosen by the Crown is to be consecrated to a "suffragan" see, and may be licensed by the nominating bishop to exercise during his pleasure such parts of his Episcopal functions as he shall be pleased to delegate to him. It was seen, therefore, that either the Archbishop, as Metropolitan, or the Bishop of London, as claiming authority in the colonies, might nominate such a bishop and send him out under his licence; and this was what the Church in America implored them to do. Perhaps there is no one circumstance in the history of this post-reformation Church more justly liable to censure than the pertinacious refusal of the English bishops to give this boon to the American colonies when they had it in their power. It is not as if they had not known their power, for it was pointed out to them by the colonists, and they were importuned to grant it. It is a small thing to say they might thus have saved the colonies from revolt. They might have saved them from that famine of the Word of God in which their revolution left them, and from that subsequent plague of schism and irreligion which has been the cancer of their country. And not the less because the multitude of sects and their activity misleads the people into the belief that they are a religious people, while pride and selfishness and unbelief prevail beyond all former example.

But if so, it may be respectfully submitted to our bishops of the present day what may be said of themselves, when another hundred years shall have gone by, if they have acknowledged the want of an increased Episcopate and have still pertinaciously adhered to the traditional prejudice which seems to deter them from putting the existing law in execution for the purpose of supplying the want. There ought to be some very strong ground indeed to justify such a course, and we have the presumption to think that no such ground exists, but that, on the contrary, this law presents some peculiar advantages. But be this as it may, the question is not whether this is the very best plan that could be devised, but whether this plan is so essentially vicious and objectionable that it is better to go on as we are, in the hope that some time it may please our rulers to give us some better law, instead of availing ourselves at once of the existing law, at least until that better system which we are looking for shall have been agreed upon and brought into operation.

The existing law for suffragan bishops gives the nomination almost entirely to the diocesan bishop who shall apply for a coadjutor. All that is reserved to the Crown is to choose between the two who may be nominated by the diocesan for selection. And surely such a privilege is not to be lightly disregarded, especially as we can never hope to get it again in any law which might now be passed. If it be said that a coadjutor nominated by a former bishop might not suit his successor, the answer is twofold. First, we do not hear of such objections in the case of archdeacons so nominated, though archdeacons have a legal status and jurisdiction which these bishops have not. And secondly, the licence of the coadjutor is only during pleasure, and therefore cannot possibly extend beyond the lifetime of his superior, unless his successor be pleased to renew it. If not, the coadjutor would remain as he was before, dean, archdeacon, or parish priest, of episcopal rank, but without episcopal employment or jurisdiction, as several retired bishops are at the present time.

And now let us see how this system *would work*, for that is essential to the due understanding of the question. Such bishops might be employed in at least three different ways. First, the coadjutor might act in the quality of what has been sometimes called "an episcopal curate," i. e. his superior might employ him for such Consecrations, Confirmations, Ordinations, and other like matters as he was himself unable to undertake. And this seems to have been the way in which the *chorepiscopi* in England were employed for four hundred years before the Reformation and for at least half a century after. We have called them coadjutors, though that is not a proper description, and Henry Wharton more correctly calls them *chorepiscopi*, without any distinction between those who were consecrated before or after the

law of Henry VIII. But it is to be observed that the English word "suffragan," which is the legal designation in that statute, however inconvenient, was not then for the first time invented (as seems to have been supposed), but, on the contrary, there has been produced the petition of Bishop Longland of Lincoln to Pope Clement VII. just before the Reformation, in May, 1529, that he would be pleased to give him as a "suffragan" the prior of a small monastery near Stamford, John Halam by name, "in coepiscopum et suffraganeum, quo mihi in officio meo suffragari possit." And it is not unworthy of notice, as showing how common this office then was, that the famous Abbot of Barlings, Matthew Makerel, who headed the Lincolnshire insurrection against Henry VIII, was himself a suffragan bishop, by the title of Calcedon in Bithynia, though this fact has escaped the researches of Mr. Froude. In truth, it appears that in some dioceses the greater part of the purely episcopal work was performed by these bishops *in partibus*, acting as coadjutors. In the diocese of Durham, in twenty-one years between 1345 and 1366, there were ordained of acolytes, sub-deacons, deacons, and priests 1604, and of these only fifty-three in all by Bishop Hatfield, the rest by his several coadjutors.* And this continued up to the time of Henry VIII, when the Act 26 Henry VIII. c. 14 made no other alteration than to provide that they should take their titles from places within the realm, and that those titles should be conferred by the King instead of by the Pope. Thus H. Wharton gives the succession of *Chorepiscopi Dioc. Cantuariensis* in the times of Cranmer, Pole, and Parker as follows,—Rich^d. Ingworth, *Ep. Doverensis*; Rich. Thornden, *ibid.*; Thom^s. Chetham, *Sidonensis* (under Pole, by the Pope); Rich^d. Rogers, *Doverensis* (the law of Henry VIII. being restored). In like manner bishops were consecrated, under this law, as coadjutors to the Bishops of London, Ely, Norwich (both for Thetford and Ipswich), Wells (Taunton), Lincoln (Bishop Kyng of Osney, and then of Oxford, seems to have been already a suffragan, by the title of *Rovenensis*), Salisbury (Marlboro'), Durham (Berwick), York (Hull and Nottingham), and there were several others throughout the reign of Elizabeth and during part of the reign of James I.

But secondly, there is no reason why the diocesan bishop of a large diocese should not give to his "suffragan" his licence to exercise his Episcopal functions, under his own superintendence, over any such part of his diocese as may seem most to be in need of a separate Episcopate. And it will be seen that the places named by the Act embrace most of those counties or districts where the want is greatest. These places are as follows:—Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftsbury, South Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Penrith, Bridgwater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Berwick, St. Germans, Pereth (in Pembrokeshire), and the Isle of Wight. Now here we have Berwick for Northumberland, St. Germans for Cornwall, Nottingham for Nottinghamshire, the three counties that seem most in want of a bishop; and though some of these places are not the best for a bishop's See, it is to be remembered that these sees, being only titular, the bishop might equally reside in some other part of the diocese. Nor is it required by the Act that the titular see should be within the diocese of the nominating diocesan; and in the well-known case of Hotchkin, the consecrator of Parker, it actually was not so, for he was suffragan of Bedford, then in the diocese of Lincoln, though he was nominated by the Bishop of London to be employed as his coadjutor. Thus then, if it were thought fit, some person might be selected by the existing bishop to act as his "suffragan" in any district which he might assign to him, to whom the Queen might give a title from any one of these titular sees. And here is also a great advantage as regards endowment. It has been often proposed to convert the endowments of the deaneries to such a purpose; and again

* This fact is supplied by a kind correspondent, who is proposing to publish more from the Durham Registers.

it has been suggested that endowments should be provided by voluntary subscription, provided some control were given to the subscribers in regard to the appointment. All these speculations, however plausible, are liable to objection, even if attainable. But here is a system, already prepared and within our reach, which admits of a modified application of various resources without committing us to any. In one case a Dean might be the most proper person; in another case a Canon, who is also now often an Archdeacon. And if the recent Pluralities Act have not touched this statute, there is provision made for the suffragan to hold two benefices, which might admit of his residing in two different parts of a diocese, besides supplying funds for his support. And then, if the inhabitants of any important district should desire to become a separate diocese, means would more easily be found for a permanent endowment after the desire had been fortified by experience. Nor could it fail to have a beneficial effect upon Episcopal appointments, if these inferior bishops should sometimes commend themselves to such promotion. They would have no right of succession, and therefore in that which is probably the proper sense of "coadjutors" they could not strictly be so called. But there would be nothing to prevent their being occasionally selected for the diocesan Episcopate.

There is yet a third way in which this law might be made use of to meet some of our present needs. In the vast expansion of the Anglican communion there have arisen difficulties about the consecration of Missionary bishops. It is now said that some of these difficulties have been incidentally created by the Act that was passed to empower the Archbishop to send a bishop to Jerusalem. And yet that Act itself is of a most questionable kind. How much better might it not have been, had it seemed good to our spiritual fathers, to have sent a titular Bishop of Dover, for instance, with licence from the Primate of all England to exercise Episcopal supervision over the members of the Anglican communion at Jerusalem, and to cultivate friendly relations with other Christian bodies there. They would have understood the functions of such a bishop, his presence would have excited no jealousy, and he would have been under the control, as he ought to be, of his own metropolitan. If, too, the bishops at home desire that Missionary bishops who are to be sent to purely heathen and foreign countries should depend rather upon the Church of Canterbury than upon the nearest metropolitan (as is said to be the case), this law appears to offer a practicable way of providing for that emergency.

Lastly, there is known to be a strong desire both in the army and navy to have a bishop of their own—an Episcopal chaplain-general. And such a desire is most laudable, and ought, if possible, to be gratified. Yet it is difficult to see how any mere Act of Parliament could meet the difficulty of interfering with the jurisdiction of each bishop in whose diocese any troops or ships might be. But let the chaplain-general be consecrated to any of these titular sees, and each bishop might give him licence, or other authority, to exercise his functions in the case of any soldiers or sailors who might be within his diocese, and so the difficulty would be met.

Here, then, we have a great and acknowledged want. We have, also, a law ready made to our hands, which promises to provide for that want. Ought we not to be well advised how we go on from year to year with our schemes and plans, by which we hope to get some favourite measure enacted, and neglect the way we have, while millions of souls are waiting for enlarged means of grace?

It seems, indeed, to have been supposed by some that this plan is uncatholic and unprimitive, and by others that it would introduce conflicting jurisdiction. Yet, surely it is more catholic than that of bishops *in partibus*, which prevailed before; and as to its being unprimitive, we know that *chorepiscopi* existed in very early times, and were discountenanced by the Roman Church; they existed in England till the Conquest, and were discontinued first by Lanfranc, but only for a time, as has been shown; and there seems to be a very close resemblance between

a bishop of a titular see, exercising his functions in a district within which that see is situated, and the case of Gregory Nazianzen, for instance, who consented to be consecrated only as his father's assistant or coadjutor, and was at liberty to leave his see as soon as his father was dead. Henry Wharton was not the man to call them *chorepiscopi* without having good reason for doing so. As for jurisdiction, we have seen that they have no jurisdiction of their own; and as they exercise their office during pleasure, it is always competent to the superior bishop to suspend such functions as they have. If it be said that they might rebel and make a schism, so might all human things be perverted by human error; but it is by waiting for human institutions to be perfect that we miss the opportunity of all healthful progress, and give occasion to unhealthy and monstrous forms of schism to develop themselves in feeling after the remedy which we have failed to supply.

It remains to say that the principal part of the information here given respecting the law herein discussed is derived from "*An Essay towards an account of Bishops Suffragan in England, occasioned by a letter of the Rev. Thomas Brett, LL.D., printed in Drake's Antiquities of the City of York.*" By the Rev. Mr. John Lewis, M.A., Minister of Margate, Kent, written A. D. 1738." This rare tract was printed by Nichols, for the Society of Antiquaries, 1784, and contains, besides much other valuable matter, the whole of H. Wharton's collections on the subject, as far as he had gone, from his MSS. in Lambeth library. It is much to be hoped that the whole of this treatise, copies of which exist in some of our public libraries, may shortly be reprinted. Lewis of Margate is well known as the author of the *Life of Wickliffe*, and the antagonist of Johnson the author of the *Vade Mecum*, &c. He, therefore, was no "High Churchman." Besides Wharton and Lewis, the restoration of these subordinate bishops has been advocated by such antiquaries as Peck, by such ritualists as Dr. Brett, and by such canonists as Bishop Gibson. It was also promised by Charles II. in his proclamation from Breda. And bishops suffragan are referred to in three of the canons of the Church of England, viz. the thirty-fifth, sixtieth, and one hundred and thirty-fifth, as being still in existence.

Child-Murder.

CHILD-MURDER is on the increase. It is of no use to attempt to conceal the fact. Burglary may be common enough, or highway robbery and garroting, but murder of the cruellest, most shameless, and most unnatural kind, has during the last year or two been steadily on the increase. The pride and purity of our boast about the chastity of English women is even in danger of being touched by a foul blot. If any one doubts this, one week's file of the daily papers will convince him of its undeniable truth. There is no need of any special cluster of statistics to prove this or that district of England, or any one class of society, to be specially branded with the infamy. All we desire, at present, is to call attention to a gross and glaring plague-spot in the social life of our lower orders, which threatens to eat out its moral worth by corrupting the fountain-head.

The Registrar-General's Reports tell us that hundreds of thousands of children die annually in England either from neglect or disease, who under proper care might be expected to live. But, besides these hapless victims, many thousands perish by direct violence, or foul play in some shape, too often at the wretched mother's own hands. We wish to strip the question of all incidental or supplementary aspects, and look at it in its plain naked deformity. The real question at issue is, if a woman murders her own child, how ought she to be punished? Whether the hapless babe live five seconds, hours, or days; whether it perishes by an act of sudden violence, or of slower and

more crafty deliberation, the crime and the guilt of that crime are pretty much the same. As the law now stands, it is all but powerless even in checking the evil. Juries will persist in acquitting on evidence abundant and clear enough to convict and transport a criminal on any other charge fifty times over. They bring in a verdict of *not guilty* in the very teeth of the most damning proof to the contrary, and not seldom in open defiance of the judge's summing up. It is perhaps a case of heartless seduction, or more than usual profligacy, on the part of the father; the mother is in circumstances of desperate need, or of absolute despair, utterly unable to face the shame and ruin which justly follow her loss of all that made life most dear to her as a woman. And if any or all of these elements of extenuation enter into the minds of the jury, a vein of piteous mercy steals in on the hardest heart of the whole nine, and the murderess is acquitted. They are but men after all; and the very thought of the poor, frail, trembling, despairing criminal at the bar being consigned to the gallows unnerves them all. They forget the oath they have taken to decide the question at issue on the evidence adduced, and on that alone, and are glad of any loophole of escape.

Or, perhaps their righteous vengeance is transferred in thought to the scoundrel whose heartless villany has helped to place the woman in the felon's dock. They wish they could but lay hands on *him*; and on his devoted head they pour countless vials of imaginary wrath. Some chance allusion to his villany, in the judge's charge, perhaps, has misdirected their attention away from the culprit to the cause of her crime. Or, more rarely it happens that the judge takes a more refined and polite view of the matter, and with the least tinge of sentimentalism touches on the crime as "one more distressing proof of the increase of *infanticide*." But, in any case, *murder* has been done, and the murderess is suffered to escape.

This is a state of things which ought not to, and cannot, continue.

Of course, it is easier to point out the evil than to suggest a remedy. Yet, something may be done in the way of suggestion. Certain principles may at least be laid down, on which it will be safe and just to act. In the first place the punishment, of whatever kind, should be fixed and certain. If a woman falls into sin, and then into crime with the hope of concealing her guilt, she should at least be sure that a certain, fixed punishment will overtake her. Conviction on the charge of child-murder should be as easy, and be conducted on the very same principles of common sense and justice as in the case of any other crime. If but one guilty woman had been hanged, transported for life, or for twenty years, for this crime,—within the last few years,—some thousands of infant lives would have been saved, and many a woman snatched from perdition. It is the *certainly* rather than the *severity* of punishment which deters men from crime. Once let it be known that if a woman murders her child by direct violence, by wilful neglect, or by some act of more deliberate malice, she will infallibly be hanged, or transported, and the aspect of the whole question is changed. The chances of escape, as the law *now* stands, are all in her favour. Whereas the crime, if it be a crime at all, is neither more nor less than wilful murder; and on this principle should the indictment be framed, the evidence be adduced, the conviction attained, and punishment awarded.

To decide positively what that punishment should be will, of course, require most careful thought, and examination of the whole question, which must be left to other hands than ours; specially to those whose office and duty it is to administer the law of England. Public opinion is, we are glad to say, taking up the question; not, we hope, to lay it aside until finally and fairly settled. Of course, there will be in many cases extenuating circumstances which may be most justly taken into account. These circumstances may even be definitely graduated into two or three classes, and to each of these may be attached a certain, fixed punishment. The indictment will embrace all these classes, and the jury will have to decide whether

the criminal has any right to the protection of any such and what extenuation; or whether she ought to be condemned as guilty of the crime in all its naked heinousness. There seems to be no possible reason why some such course of legal treatment should not be applied to the guilty mother. If the father also render himself liable to be included in the indictment as an accomplice, as having a guilty knowledge of the crime, or as an accessory before the act,—one more step will be gained towards the *prevention* of shameful and degrading crime, which in this case is eminently better than *cure*.

With regard to illegitimate children the very same principle applies with equal if not greater cogency. The birth of such children is, of course, the main cause of the crime. Let, therefore, in this case the punishment be equally certain; let it fall not on the guilty mother alone, but touch the father also; and that not only in pocket, but in name and position. If after betraying and degrading the mother of his child he so treats her as to force her to appeal publicly to the law for help in the support of their offspring, why should he not be bound to pay towards its support in proportion to his own circumstances and position in life? The half-crown per week that is a heavy pull on the wages of Hodge the ploughman, Dick the carpenter, or Sandy the grocer, is nothing out of the pocket of the squire, the dandy in Rotten Row, or the city merchant. But, if Horatio Belville had to pay three, four, five, or six half-crowns per week, according to circumstances; to *appear* in the felon's dock to have the charge proved against him, and judgment passed; if his name were duly entered in a public record as having, on certain proved facts, to make a certain fixed payment to a certain public officer for the maintenance of a certain child until he or she either deceased or reached the age of twenty-one;—if he knew all this would certainly come to pass, and his name be registered in a certain book as having paid the penalty, many an act of guilty shame would be prevented. Part of such payment, according to the circumstances of the case, would go towards the support of the mother herself, and part to that of the child, who might be taken entirely away from the control and care of the parent; and thus in many cases inflict further punishment on the mother.

To this scheme a hundred objections would, of course, be at once raised; *e.g.* it must often fail for want of funds; the man after a time might be unable, or refuse, to pay; or evade payment by absconding; many such criminals would be too glad thus to get rid of the burden of illegitimate children. Granted, freely; but objections equally numerous and equally valid might be brought against any scheme whatever. Nothing can be much worse than the present state of things; and the scheme which we have outlined contains, we think, in spite of all objections, some safe principles of legislation. We are quite aware that people cannot be made virtuous, more than they can be made wise, or tall, by Act of Parliament; but they can be checked in any career of vice, or of guilty shame, by making that vice not only more shameful, but more offensively expensive, and annoying in its results. If neither religious principle, nor moral obligation, if no sense of honour, decency, or shame, deter them from sinful gratification, a more selfish motive may possibly have weight, if not in all cases, yet in some. If we cannot at once remove the foul blot which is now staining our criminal statistics, and the fair fame of our national morality, we must be content to lessen its hideous dimensions; if not by one triumphant sweep, then little by little and grain by grain. All growth, for good or evil, is slow. We must be content to prune the tree, to give it air, light, sunshine, and moisture. We can neither gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles. But we can check the growth of weeds, and help every tree to bear its own fruit. If legal enactments cannot make men and women wiser or more virtuous, it may at least help to check, restrain, or deter them. It may make them pause to count the cost, if not before beginning a course of crime, at some one stage of the career before the last and final and fatal

catastrophe. If we cannot do all we wish, we must be content to do what we can.

Burial Clubs, their infamous management, and the still more infamous use that is made of them, we reserve for a future article.

Causes which produced the Low Religious Tone of the Eighteenth Century.

DIVINE authority has warned us against building on the sand; and the principle involved in the warning is one of universal application. When latitudinarianism has weakened men's hold on their creeds, their hold on those things which the creeds represent will soon be feeble. An evaporated and colourless religious system will awaken no zeal and kindle no enthusiasm. Men will grasp faintly what they only believe in partially. Having begun to surrender, they will continue to give up point after point until nothing remains distinctive and clear—nothing but the hazy clouds and neutral tints of natural religion.

That this was the religious history of the eighteenth century most thinking men will admit, and that the deplorable amount of disbelief in the primal articles of the faith which prevailed was greatly owing to the spread of latitudinarian views Churchmen at least will not deny. But that there were other causes at work to produce this unhappy result—causes for which the Low Church party are not specially responsible—it will be our business now to show.

The first of these causes is connected with the grant of toleration at the time of the Revolution. Not only the Latitudinarians proper—Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Wake—but Sancroft also, and the High Church school, were the advocates of toleration. Not a voice, in fact, was raised against it. It was obvious to all that it was necessary, as well as just and fair. But this was a very sudden conversion. A few years before the men who now advocated toleration had looked upon it as a sin. The reign of James II. had worked the change. In that time of persecution and danger, while all that was dearest was threatened, Churchmen and the more respectable Dissenters had felt that their cause was a common one. They had been drawn together, had worked together, been menaced together, and conquered together. The famous petition of the seven bishops had admitted the rights of Dissenters; when the Revolution came it was impossible that Churchmen could ignore those rights. But to be driven, under the pressure of circumstances, to advocate measures at the rightness of which you have not arrived by the ordinary path of conviction is not salutary to the moral nature.

Upon the granting of toleration there arose a good deal of dissatisfaction and some disingenuousness. Attempts were made to revenge with the pen the concessions which had been made inevitable by the course of events, and bitter things were said which had better have been left unsaid. The controversy between Church and Dissenters continued, but the subject-matter of it was changed. They did not now contend about conformity, but they argued about doctrinal points. A mischievous and damaging dispute on some of the highest mysteries of revelation marked the commencement of the eighteenth century. This was begun, indeed, among the Dissenters, but speedily enlisted Church writers on either side. "The heats," says Calamy, "were perfectly scandalous." The Arian, Socinian, and Sabellian heresies, and indeed every form of error, found ready advocates. Religion must needs suffer when men argue harshly and write fiercely about its fundamental verities, and when such subjects are made the vehicles for venting pent-up and exasperated spleen.

And while the Church was laughing at and embittering the quarrels of the Dissenters, it was involved in a dispute

* Autobiography, i. 356.

of its own, which in its origin and in its effects contributed more to damage the religious tone of the eighteenth century than any other cause whatsoever. The question of taking the oaths to William when they had been previously taken to James was a difficult one for every conscientious man; and even if we think we see our way clear, it would be presumptuous to censure what Sancroft, Kettlewell, and Ken thought their paramount and evident duty. But without judging the principle, we may note the plain and most disastrous effect which the great schism of the non-jurors had upon the Church of England, at a time of change, commotion, and danger, when lax opinions were becoming prevalent, and were openly favoured in high places; at this critical time, the Church suddenly lost nine prelates and more than four hundred of the lower clergy. And who were the men who were thus lost to her? Some of the most conscientious, most learned, and most holy of her sons. Bishops such as Frampton and Ken; presbyters such as Hickes, Collier, Leslie, and Kettlewell; not to speak of laymen such as Robert Nelson and Henry Dodwell. These men were drained away from the Church of England in the time of her great need, and from being her champions and zealous defenders came to turn their arms against her, and accuse her of schism, immorality, and perjury. With the nonjurors disappeared almost all the prominent men who held High Church opinions, and the place of honour was now completely surrendered to Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Burnet, and the Latitudinarian school. And this was not a mere temporary loss. Against the wishes of the best and wisest and most holy of their number, in spite of the remonstrances of Ken and Frampton, and Nelson and Dodwell, the nonjurors took the fatal course of perpetuating their schism. Opposing lines of bishops contended for the allegiance of Churchmen. Disputes, and rival claims, and bickerings, and petty intrigues predominated, until the very names of succession and episcopacy, and even Church itself, stank in the nostrils of men. We need but glance at the history of the nonjurors to find an abundant explanation of the utter disrepute and contempt into which Church principles had fallen before the end of the eighteenth century.

Concurrently with these damaging circumstances, and when the opinions of the good and wise were most urgently needed to be heard, the Church suddenly lost her voice and power of expression. To the silencing of Convocation, indeed, is to be attributed no small part of the mischief which overwhelmed the Church. When ordained clergymen preached Deism and talked Atheism; when there was not wanting an instance of a beneficed clergyman publishing a treatise in defence of concubinage; when scandals were rife and bishops careless or powerless, assuredly effective synodical action was most urgently needed. But a constrained silence was enforced by the State, and only those clergymen who justified this oppression were promoted to high places. Betrayed by her prelates, disgraced by many of her clergy, with difficulties and dangers on every path, the Church lost her energy, and sank in prostrate helplessness. Every energetic attempt to enforce her distinctive doctrines, and cause her true voice to be heard was derided as enthusiasm, or denounced as Popery. To ground exhortations on the great doctrines of the Gospel, to exhibit the true value of the Sacraments, to remind Christians of their privileges and responsibilities, had been laughed out of fashion, and men were now content with the dregs of the philosophy of the Stoics and Epicureans. A very superficial acquaintance with the nature and amount of the scandals rampant in the Church, and the utter prostration of religious teaching which had taken place, will serve to excuse the irregular revivalism of Wesley and Whitfield, and even to make us thankful for its effects. The ordeal, indeed, has been somewhat dangerous, but the result is satisfactory. We seem, at last, to have reached firm ground, and to see our way clear before us. There are yet in our Church remains, and considerable ones, of the eighteenth century tone and treatment of religious matters. There is a large but rapidly decreasing amount of the irregular spiritualism

which was developed out of the religious deadness of that time. Both these elements need to be, and we trust will be, absorbed into that true Churchmanship which is at once orthodox and energetic, evangelical and temperate. Even those who cannot accept the creed of the Church should desire this consummation. History abundantly shows that loose views in religion are always coincident with a loose practice of morality, and the history of the eighteenth century exhibits this, perhaps, more strikingly than any other. The low tone of religious teaching which then prevailed revealed itself distinctly in the daily life of the nation. The foregoing were some of the chief causes which combined with the spread of Latitudinarian principles to produce it.

Commercial Travellers.

ODERN commerce has produced a race of knights errant unknown to ancient chivalry. About them there is nothing Quixotic; their purpose is tolerably definite. They have no notions of slaying giants or rescuing distressed damsels. They stop at inns instead of castles; and learned indeed are they as to the quality of wines, the excellence of dinners, and the promptitude of that useful personage yclept boots. Tory journalists used, in days gone by, to call them bagmen; but they are more politely and euphoniously styled commercial travellers.

The commercial traveller of the present day differs considerably from him who existed before railways. Railways have altered the characteristics of the race, and we incline to believe that railways and the telegraph will altogether abolish them. The commercial gentleman who drove in a light trap from town to town, and who occasionally encountered a highwayman, had some touch of romance about him. In nowise romantic is his jolly-looking successor, who travels first-class upon the railway, and who stops at hostleries where the port and the dinners are also first-class. For him the tenderest mutton, the earliest asparagus, and the oldest wine, are always provided. Happy, in the Epicurean sense, would be the life he leads, if he never encountered bad debts or cantankerous customers. Of course, there is the risk of his becoming *Epicuri de grege porcus*. A certain vulgar luxury is, we suspect, necessary to him. The luxury of the aristocrat, whose dinners have all the advantages of artistic cookery, costly plate, exquisite glass, fragrant flowers, is, to some extent, refined; wit sparkles "around the mahogany tree," and pretty women add their own peculiar charm. But who can think, without a shudder, of the heavy dinner at the country inn, wholly devoid of tasteful adornment, where a company of men meet together to feed and talk about trade?

Retail tradesmen are apt to look on the commercial traveller as a person better off than he deserves to be. His enjoyments are numerous; the landlords of all the inns he frequents have a paternal regard for his comfort, and he has a perpetual change of scene. He is also a well-paid man. But the position has its drawbacks. Commercial gentlemen must marry, and to a well-regulated mind it must be a severe infliction to see one's wife and children only once in three months or thereabouts. We never notice a good-looking "commercial" smoking his matutine cigar at his inn-door without the reflection that very possibly his heart is breaking (under a handsome waistcoat) for his absent wife and family. Compulsory bachelorship is a great grief to any one who has known domestic happiness. Still, the commercial traveller is not so badly off as the naval or military officer, who, just after his marriage, is ordered off to Rio or Hong Kong for five years. But then the soldier or sailor has the consolation of a noble task to be performed; he is serving his Queen and his country, while the other has only the sordid business of persuading shopkeepers to buy his goods. Men can "suffer and be strong" when they have high deeds to do and a heavy trust to keep.

Commercial men are either tolerably clever or very dull. They see so much of life and character—of men and cities—like Odysseus of old—

πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω—

that, unless they were born without brains their conversation ought to be worth listening to. Of course, we must remember that sordid subjects, such as bad debts and dishonoured bills, are of primary importance with them. Wherefore their temperament is, in most cases, by no means poetical or philosophical; but, if Nature gave them at their birth an average quantity of "nous," they are pretty sure to be shrewd, sensible, and amusing. Literary they are not; but it is curious that the *Cornhill Magazine* seems to be teaching them that there exists such a thing as literature. Its brilliant yellow covers glare on the commercial eye, and we suspect that a good many of the multitudinous copies which the publishers boast of selling fall into commercial hands. Mr. Trollope evidently thought so, and produced a tale—*Brown, Jones, and Robinson*—exactly suited to their intellectual calibre. We recollect a railway carriage conversation with a commercial traveller soon after the *Cornhill's* first appearance. Thackeray and Trollope were fresh revelations to him; he had never heard of *Vanity Fair* or *Barchester Towers*; he was entering a new world. His gratitude was enormous for a list of books, by the author of *Framley Parsonage*, which might be obtained at any library.

Your "Liberal" critic, sneering at the bucolic mind, will scarcely believe in such ignorance in one of his special favorites. For it is the liberal creed that the commercial traveller represents civilization.

After all, commercial travelling is a clumsy expedient which will probably disappear with the development of commerce. It must be enormously expensive; and when both wholesale and retail firms are on a sound basis, and are sensibly conducted, it is wholly unnecessary. Its results are in some cases objectionable. Where the commercial traveller is plausible and persuasive, the retailer often buys more than he needs, and is obliged to use the same plausibility and persuasiveness towards his customers. Hence it is that when a lady visits a second-rate shop for something which she wants, she is implored to buy a dozen things which she does not want. To buy what you do not want is simply immoral; it too frequently leads to buying what you cannot pay for. The traveller is interested in selling all he can; the retail tradesmen, if at all in arrear to the wholesale house, is anxious to oblige the traveller, and sometimes makes purchases for which he will never be able to pay; and thus the canvassing system leads to commercial disaster. If there were no middleman between the warehouse and the shop—if the retail tradesman visited London or Manchester to buy for himself, using the telegraph on emergency—the commercial traveller's occupation would be gone. This result will ultimately arrive.

The religious aspect of the fraternity, to judge from the autobiography of a commercial traveller recently published, is not pleasing, though we have known very honourable exceptions. There is a case well known to many in the West of England, in which gratitude for benefits of teaching, received at the hands of a parish priest, in a Sunday school, by a boy who afterwards became a commercial traveller, issued in years of untiring and successful exertion to collect funds in aid of the labours of the parish priest, when he became a colonial bishop, to build and complete his cathedral and church. The commercial room of an hotel is commonly on Sunday morning filled with travellers making up their books and writing their letters. We fear it can hardly be otherwise. The life of many of these men is sensual, sordid, and undomestic: their occupation not exalting, their pleasures vulgar. They are separated from their homes and from the humanizing, Christianizing influence unconsciously exercised by a loving wife and innocent children. With no parish priest have they any direct relation. They are nomadic, vagabond. Here is another argument for the abolition of a system which is intrinsically injurious to

healthy commerce. If we are right in our belief, that the commercial traveller promotes unsound trading, and at the same time degrades himself, it is clear that English commerce ought to get rid of him. We hold this result to be as inevitable as it will be advantageous.

Mission-houses in Populous Places.



WE called attention in July to the new agency of Mission-houses at work in the rural parishes of England and Wales. The *Guardian* newspaper had, on the 6th of August, the following passage in reference to the Incorporated Church Building Society:—"A special fund has been formed for the erection of School-churches and Mission-houses, to the want of which every county in the kingdom can bear witness—the agricultural districts, in their detached knots of neglected labourers miles away from their church—the town, in their alleys crowded with poor who are utter strangers to the House of God, and must remain so until special provision is made for them."

It is to the working of the Mission-house scheme in relation to these "alleys crowded with poor" that we would now speak.

How and where is the Mission-house to be formed? Perhaps experience will enlighten us upon this point better than theory. We will speak of what we have known and seen.

1. A room was hired in a low and profligate neighbourhood at three shillings and sixpence a-week. A free school for boys was opened in it at evening. When the school had been made sufficiently known, and was considered sufficiently thriving, a house was taken; one floor was fitted up as a Mission-room, and the other chambers of the house let to respectable tenants. Besides the school, Divine Service was regularly held in the Mission-room on Sunday evenings, and occasionally at other times. The "roughs" threatened an insurrection; and on one occasion assembled in numbers "to pull the parson out of his pulpit." No actual violence took place; but an old woman of the neighbourhood was roused to such a pitch of virtuous indignation as to give vent to it the day following in the words, "They wanted to pull you out of the pulpit, did they? They should have seen, if they had tried it, *how we'd have fought for you*." She really expressed the popular sentiment. By the simple bringing the Gospel home to the locality the people became changed. The police—to whom the neighbourhood was best known—were themselves witnesses to the change that passed over them, and would now cheerfully testify to the good done by that little Mission-house in that profligate and vicious spot of London.

2. A chapel and house had been deserted by the Roman Catholics on gaining possession of larger grounds and a statelier edifice. The parish priest entered and took possession. He was a poor man, and wanted funds to maintain an infant school there, while he promised to appropriate seats in the gallery, for a Wednesday Evening Service he established, to every one who would contribute half-a-guinea a year to his Mission. Was this an abuse of pew-rents? It is open to any to think so; but the poor parson imagined himself justified. The funds did not nearly suffice for the object, nor had he expected they would do so. They were only the beginning. He next called for volunteers from his Sunday-school teachers and district visitors:—"Who will collect twelve pence a week from the poor they are in the habit of visiting for a poor school?" Answers were favourably given, and he was soon in receipt of fifty pounds per annum from twenty collectors of a shilling weekly! Thus a Mission-house was established, which has resulted in a district parish with its church, school, and clergyman, in a very poor and densely-populated neighbourhood.

3. One more instance. The vicar of a large and wealthy parish found a low street with no less than seven-

teen courts and alleys on its two sides. He discovered at one end of one of the narrowest courts a room—formerly used as a low billiard-room—which he hired. It was capable of accommodating one hundred worshippers. There he established a Mission, and began by opening a free evening school for youth. In a school shortly afterwards opened for certain days in the week for elder girls he was aided by some of those "great ladies," as they are sometimes called, whose deep Christian piety and practical Christian graces adorn and dignify many who are placed in the most eminent positions of the land. Every Sunday evening Divine Service was solemnized, according to the order of the Church, to a devout congregation; and the singing was led by a layman whose gifts have rendered him one of the most illustrious servants of the Crown, but whose self-devoted labours in the cause of Christ can only be known at the Great Day. On a week-day evening a plainer and simpler service, accompanied always by the reading and exposition of Holy Scripture, was solemnized. The incumbent who initiated the Mission passed away: but so impressed was his successor with the importance of the work that he has consolidated and enlarged the Mission; and now a dignified, not to say stately, Mission-house adorns the neighbourhood where the humbler meetings of a few poor parishioners with their parish clergy were first assembled.

These are a few known instances of the Mission-house scheme applied to populous places, as those before enumerated illustrated its working in rural districts: and we have reason to believe that such instances are multiplying every year. They all tell the same plain tale: that an agency is needed in subordination to the parish churches; so that the people shall not only be invited to "come to church;" but that, where ignorant, or unwilling, *the church shall come to them* and prepare them for her higher and more complete form of worship. Are they to be left to the seductions of the infidel reasoner, the snares of sensual pollution, or the well-meant but ill-directed enthusiasm of the sects? Clearly they need a special instrumentality to meet their case. The parish priest has a Mission to them; and wherever the parish church is insufficient, he ought to have a Mission-house for them!

Cricket.



NATIONAL character is said to be the correlative of a people's ballads; that, given the making of the latter, the moulding of the former is a safe result. But the terms of the relation are convertible, and have a reciprocal effect. Are not the ballads the embodiment and exponent, rather than the producing cause, of the people's character? And the saying is equally true of national games and sports. They both develop and are developments of the national character. Fox-hunting, boating, and cricket, for example, bear pretty much the same relation to the English character as *Chey Chase* or *Rule Britannia*. It is difficult to decide whether, taking cricket as unquestionably our most popular national game, it is most the cause or the effect, so far as it is either, of an Englishman's superiority in those physical and moral qualities for which he stands pre-eminent and is distinguished above other peoples.

The merits of cricket, indeed, as a game, will bear close investigation. It demands strength, skill, agility, activity, constant attention, obedience to rule, unflagging interest, friendly competition, patient endurance, indefatigable perseverance, out-of-door exercise, and breathing of fresh air. The concurrence of so many moral and physical advantages must, one would think, very largely conduce to the development of a *manly* character, and be among the best training-schools of "muscular Christianity." Boating and hunting, mentioned above, are too expensive, and presume conditions of too exceptional a kind, to become amusements of the common people. Other games which combine many of the above advantages are either again over

expensive, as tennis, or too rough and dangerous, as goff, hockey, or even football, for younger lads at least, in mingled ranks and classes. Cricket may be played anywhere, and is within the reach of all; and is suitable to all ages and social classes alike. It is unattended with serious danger to life and limb, or of unhealthful over-exertion. It brings together separate ranks and neighbourhoods on a friendly footing, whether as active partners in the sport or as spectators and partisans. What poor stuff is archery compared with it, as practised by our toxophilite societies!—or again with the cross-bow and popinjay of our continental neighbours! We own, too, that we should have felt an extreme jealousy of “the Volunteer Rifle Corps movement” in our day, as threatening to substitute another specially continental method of exertion, morally and physically far inferior, for our national game, had not cricket at the same time been gaining a wider and firmer hold than ever on the popular taste. Even the *Times* now will condescend to lighten its pages with the statistical details of the last grand cricket match at Lord’s ground, and duly chronicle in parallel columns the items of the two innings on both sides—as who caught out whom, and who was bowled out by whom, how many runs were added to the score by byes and wide-balls, and how many wickets were to go down when the Little Peggletonians won the game. Within its widening circle of admirers cricket has quite an ambitious literature of its own. We have now lying before us, “Sixteenth Edition, making a previous sale of 88,000; by authority and under the distinguished patronage of the Marylebone and Surrey Cricket Clubs, Lillywhite’s Guide to Cricketers, with a review and averages of the past season; also notes upon all gentlemen and professionals. Spring edition, 1862.” And certainly this wonderful compilation of varied, extensive, and accurate information, all purchasable for a few pence, does credit to the traditional name of its author, and must render it more highly honoured than ever in the cricket world. Nor is he the only son of his father who maintains the hereditary prestige. One of the family is the great “Cricketing Outfitter to the Army and Navy at home and abroad, and all the principal Clubs, Schools, and Colleges in the United Kingdom,” and is the inventor of the “*Patent Balista*,” which is said to be “a great improvement on the *Catapulta*.” Another brother is the “professional,” or “expert,” in the noble science to Cheltenham College. To the multiplication of these first-rate public grammar-schools we attribute in no small measure the increased popularity of the game. We are glad to find in the register of colleges and schools retaining a “professional” not only Eton, Winchester, Rugby, Westminster, (Harrow is unrecorded), but also Cheltenham, Tonbridge, Bury, Rossall, Highgate, Sherborne, Uppingham, and even the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester. Several others, not possessing the advantage, stand high in professional estimation. Among them we must not omit to mention specially Oscott and Guy’s Hospital. At the Universities, we understand, cricketing and boating are now, beyond any previous period, the favourite recreations, and (to the dismay of the old stable-keepers) bid fair to supersede the far more expensive if not demoralizing habits of objectless buggy-driving, hack-riding, and “larking across the country.” By the cricketing community at large the same progress in popularity has been gained; and we rejoice in the belief that the movement is advancing. “If,” says the spirited writer of the little manual already quoted, “any further proof be required as to the increasing popularity of the game, it may be mentioned that not only did eleven of England visit Canada and the United States, with success throughout, but that now these pages have to chronicle an eleven in Australia.” Can the most daring exploit of the Alpine Club be compared for zeal, pluck, and healthy emulation to this three months’ voyage across some fifteen thousand miles of the Atlantic and Pacific, and home again, for the sake of exhibiting first-rate skill in, and preserving the traditions of, the national pastime among our expatriated fellow-countrymen in England’s most distant colony? Allowing to the utmost the influence of

mere mercenary motive, we cannot but regard the originator of the expedition as a benefactor of the whole colonial race.

Honour is due to any one, clergyman or layman, who succeeds in establishing an eleven among parochial institutions, where one did not exist before. Village reading-rooms and national-school bands, and travelling book-hawkers, are, no doubt, very good things, so far as they go, but we would very much rather have a parish cricket-club than any of them. Where the tradition already exists (and in Kent there is no parish where, when there is no more available sward at hand, that by the turnpike-road is not turned into a cricket ground) there is of course no need for interference, except so far as one’s personal authority and regulation of the club can prevent any possible abuses. But there are neighbourhoods, indeed whole counties in different parts of England, where a game of cricket is seldom seen, and parishes where by the younger portion of the community it has never been so much as heard of. It is really a labour of love, requiring much patience, perseverance, and faith in the moral excellence of the game, to introduce it for the first time in such places, and to train the people to a sufficient skill in playing as to secure their interest and emulation. They will be ready enough for a time to knock about a ball at haphazard, and, perhaps, fully enter into the spirit of “tip and run;” but the mysteries and intricacy of proper places and distance,—the nicety and stringency of traditional rules,—the practised habits of good batting, fielding, and bowling,—the skilled tactics and manœuvres required in the conduct of a regular match,—are more than the untutored rustic mind can compass. And the patriotic layman or clergyman, if he be one, who undertakes the Herculean task of initiating such disciplinary pastime, must give himself up in earnest to be the “professional” of his parish club, and even in the Rochester diocese must not think it too trivial to stand “umpire.” The men of Kent, no doubt, will say that their hereditary character is witnessed to by their traditionary skill in cricket; and that the cricketer *nascitur non fit*. But we have great faith, as we stated at the opening of this article, in the reciprocal and reactionary efficacy of popular games. We sincerely believe that a well-regulated cricket-club deserves to find a place in the organization of every wisely-ordered parish; that the necessary cost of time and labour would be amply repaid by a proportionate moral and even intellectual improvement; and that any one who, single-handed, and notwithstanding every discouragement, achieved such a social success, has a claim to be remembered with the names of John Marshall, Alfred Mynn, Frederick Beauclerk, and a few others, who are ranked as “heroes” by all devotees of cricket.

Religious Statistics of Scotland.



IT is amazing how very imperfectly the religious position of North Britain is understood by the great majority of Englishmen. When, about five-and-thirty years ago, one of our bishops expressed his entire ignorance even of the existence of a Scottish Church in full communion with our own, he was but speaking no doubt for two-thirds of his clergy. And as regards information such is the case, in its degree, at the present time. True, people are not now found who would be willing to father this statement, but the general knowledge of the Religious Statistics of Scotland is still extremely misty and vague, and few have the opportunity of gaining that information which it is the object of this article to afford in a brief and comprehensive form.

Notwithstanding the Free Kirk secession the Scotch Establishment is in a clear majority. This may not be so in certain of the large towns where the trading classes have taken a decided and vigorous line in support of the recently-constituted community; but it is so throughout the country generally, where in matters of religious feeling the great

mass of the people are eminently conservative. There are eighty-five Presbyteries, as they are termed, in the Establishment, and, in round numbers, about three thousand ministers. The Clerk of the Presbytery corresponds in many particulars to our Rural-dean. In some Presbyteries meetings are held as frequently as once a-month, in others as seldom as twice a-year. The General Assembly, under the presidency of a Moderator, meets in May. As regards presentations to benefices, the patronage is vested sometimes in the Crown, frequently in the laird, or landed-proprietor who owns the adjacent property, and occasionally in trustees or the communicants. Baptism is administered publicly before the congregation, the minister standing in the pulpit, to the side of which is frequently affixed a brass frame for a bason. The child is presented by the parents or friends. The formula is strictly orthodox. The rite of communion is administered twice a-year—for which temporary tables are placed down the aisles. The minister at the head gives a short address, and then passes round the bread and wine, of which the people partake sitting. The public services are the same in kind with those used by the sectarians known as Independents in England. With many of the ministers of the Establishment a desire is arising to re-introduce much that was cast off two centuries ago, and it is only the strict supervision which the Presbyteries exercise over the acts of individuals which prevents “innovations in the direction of Episcopacy.” The communion is never given to the sick, nor is there any form, either sanctioned or customary, for the visitation of the sick or the burial of the dead. The latter ceremony is the dreariest and most appalling sight possible, and the state of the churchyards and burying-places would not be credited here.

In the Free Church—the doctrine and discipline of which is identical, save on the point of state interference, with that of the Establishment,—the Presbyteries number seventy-one, but the ministers are by no means as numerous as those of the latter. They possibly number a little more than half. Their strongholds are Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. In the former city they have about six-and-thirty ministers, at Glasgow about forty, and at Aberdeen about twenty. Their energy and self-sacrifice are undoubted, and their general influence throughout the country is more than commensurate with their numbers. They lose no opportunity of opening a new station and of gathering together a flock; while their financial matters and other points of business and organization are in no way inferior to those of the Establishment.

In the “United Presbyterian Church,” so called, a schism of the last century, there are thirty-one Presbyteries—the clergy numbering between five and six hundred. This is a body that works harmoniously with the other Presbyterian communities, and has a very considerable influence in certain localities. Its doctrines and discipline are those of Presbyterianism in general.

The two communities in Scotland which claim for themselves the gift of the priesthood and the apostolic succession are, respectively, the Roman Catholic body and the Scottish Episcopalians. The Roman Catholics are strictly in a missionary condition; being governed by three bishops *in partibus*. They number 180 clergymen. The Scottish Episcopalians are governed by seven bishops, who retain the ancient titles, and possess about 165 clergymen. The strongholds of the former are Glasgow and Dundee, where the immigration of Irish adds materially to their numbers; while Aberdeenshire, and certain portions of the western Highlands, are the places where the “Episcopalians” are more numerous.

The Roman Catholic Church is divided into three districts—eastern, western, and northern; and these again are subdivided into provostries. In the eastern district there are fifty-one clergy and thirty-two churches. In the western, ninety clergy and sixty-one churches; while in the northern there are thirty-one clergy and thirty-two churches. There is one college for the training of priests near Aberdeen, and several convents. Last year in Glasgow alone about 1700 persons were confirmed. The in-

crease of the machinery of the Roman Catholic Church during the past twenty years has been remarkable.

In the Episcopal Church, under the Bishop, is a Dean of the diocese, whose office corresponds with that of arch-deacon amongst ourselves. Diocesan Synods are held annually, at which the bishop delivers a charge, and the statistics of the diocese are laid before the synod, and preserved by the synod clerk. Edinburgh, just at present, has the greatest number of clergy; but Dundee possibly contains more members of this communion than any other large town. At Glasgow, Aberdeen, Perth, and Inverness there are large and flourishing congregations of Scottish Episcopalians. The parochial system is unknown, owing, no doubt, to the bitter persecutions of past days. At present the system, unhappily, is purely congregational. No great advance in numbers has been made during the past few years—certainly no proper advance—except in schools and school work, which is reported to be exceedingly satisfactory. The state of the Churches in the main is very far below that in England; and the general apathy of the laity is an incubus which grievously hinders true progress. The clergy are miserably paid, and are generally taken from a low rank in life. The missionary spirit has little or no existence. Since the recent theological differences have come before the public, however, much more is known of the principles of the Episcopalians by the general body of the public than was formerly the case. And this, of course, is an advantage. For many years the Episcopalians were well-nigh paralysed, when the penal laws were in force. Excuses may, therefore, be made for their present very unsatisfactory* position, which is neither missionary nor established.

There are other bodies of Presbyterians likewise, differing but slightly either in dogma or practice from their brethren of the Establishment, but separating from them on some minor detail. The United Original Seceders have twenty-seven congregations throughout Scotland, Glasgow being their head-quarters and stronghold.

The Reformed Presbyterians number about fifty charges. Their annual meeting is held at Glasgow, where also they have a Divinity Hall. Their community is divided into six Presbyteries.

The Congregational Churches—synonymous with the Independents of England—are about ninety in number. Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen are their head-quarters.

Another form of Presbyterianism is known as the Evangelical Union and Affiliated Churches, of which there are about sixty in various parts of Scotland. The Baptists number nearly ninety meeting-houses, and at Edinburgh are said to have made some progress amongst the lower classes.

Wesleyanism does not suit the Scotch habit of mind. Their tenets are unpopular, and their plan of changing their ministers once in three years is fatal to success in a country where personal popularity is the mainspring of success. There are only twenty-two meeting-houses of the Wesleyans in the whole of Scotland—four of which are at Glasgow and three at Aberdeen. There are eight schismatical chapels in various parts, in which clergymen of the United Church of England and Ireland minister without any sanction from the Scotch bishops, and in defiance of them—a practice which cannot be too strongly condemned. And there are five Unitarian places of meeting in the north. The remaining sects are chiefly obscure, and are certainly too numerous to mention.

With these facts before our readers—whose sympathies will in the main be with the ancient Church of Scotland (now technically known as “Scottish Episcopalians”)—they will have little difficulty in judging of the needs of the North from a religious point of view. The imperfect systems around and about would infallibly give way to that which uses as its motto, “Evangelical truth and Apostolical order,” were the means and machinery for increase at hand.

* For further information concerning this interesting portion of the Reformed Catholic Church, we refer our readers to an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1862, which will well repay perusal.

But the missionary spirit is lacking. If there is to be increase there must be faith and zeal; and above all there must be charity. The fault of creating divisions, and uncertain utterance as regards the sacraments, are grievous hindrances and offences. But the message of reconciliation must be delivered with love. There must be no hard words or bitter phrases, but a continual preaching, by delivery of the truth and kindly deeds and words, of the ancient faith. The Scotch Church has the fullest liberty to reconstruct the ancient machinery for work, to adapt it to modern needs, and to win back the poor of Christ's flock, who are frequently said to be thoroughly neglected by the Presbyterian teachers.

We could earnestly wish that in lieu of personal squabbles, and unworthy attempts to disparage the Holy Communion Office, the bishops and clergy would be up and stirring—as is the case at Dundee, under the Bishop of Brechin—to do a great practical work, and to regain the poor. The upper-classes—slow, sleepy, and apathetic—are mainly Episcopalians by tradition; the middle-classes follow their example because it is respectable so to do; but the trading portion of the latter are almost Presbyterians to a man. The poor are too often neglected on all hands. Unless, therefore, the Episcopal Church attempts to do the work that is so greatly needed, and is before her, the Roman Catholics will infallibly step in and do it in her stead. Let the Catholic Church in Scotland take timely warning. The gift of the priesthood, the episcopal succession, with the ancient sees, an orthodox and primitive Prayer-book, are not gifts which have been given for nothing.

Sons of the Turf.

WE believe it was Mrs. Beecher Stowe who remarked that two things specially astonished her in England—dinner and turf. The artistic dinners to which English people of any standing sit down every day were a source of amazement to her. Equally amazing were the slopes and terraces of turf, greener than emerald and softer than velvet, which she saw not around ducal residences only, but even more carefully kept in the grounds of the People's Palace at Sydenham. M. Esquiros, a more acute observer of English habits, praises us for our trees, our horses, and our women. He tells us that no sight on earth can equal a beautiful English girl reining in her thoroughbred beneath such a tree as you find in the London parks. Both the American and the French critic are paying homage to a culture unlike their own. The English dinner and the English tree are necessities of our life. We are a hard-working people; we have found that intellectual toil is unendurable unless the body is well sustained; unless there is some recreation; we have discovered that a well-ordered dinner, a dinner both scientific and artistic, with agreeable company around the table, is the best of refreshment after our diurnal labour—and that pleasant gardens and far-stretching lawns with great trees upon them are delicious to him who is tired of civic life. So, with us, dinners, and turf, and trees are great institutions. Englishmen also find exercise a necessity: hence the horse and the dog are our favourite friends. Neither Mrs. Stowe nor M. Esquiros seem to have been struck by our "doggish" tendencies—but at that we are not surprised. The lady was naturally astounded by our elaborate dinners, and our miles of lawn; while the gentleman lost his heart to every pretty girl he saw in Rotten Row. Who shall blame him, when he was gazing upon the sweet consummate flower of that which we venture to believe the foremost race in the world?

The turf has come to include horse-racing and all its concomitants. The phrase is convenient. Grass is as much a necessity for cricketers as for horses, but the more exciting and popular sport monopolizes the title. We propose to deal briefly with the persons to whom the Turf is a profession.

A broad distinction must be drawn between the owner of horses and the mere betting man. The former is a public benefactor, inasmuch as without trials of speed between horses the English breed could not be kept up to its present pitch of excellence. Even the little Exmoor ponies on which we mount our children owe some of their strength, and gentleness, and grace to the admixture of racing blood. But owners of horses are of many grades. The opulent nobleman or gentleman keeps his racing stud for the sake of the sport itself; whereas, there are small speculators whose sole object is betting, and who are quite capable of intentionally losing a race if money may thereby be obtained. Betting is the inevitable vice of the turf. A high authority on the subject remarks that "the speculator on other people's horses can only succeed by one or the other of these three expedients—great knowledge of horseflesh and astute observation of public running, deep calculation, or secret fraud." The latter plan has unhappily too many votaries. We hear of horses guarded day and night by prizefighters and bulldogs on the eve of a great race, while fish are kept in the water which they drink, in order to detect poison. The utmost precaution is often baffled, as the present year has proved in the case of a Derby favourite. Then there are persons who act as touts or spies, hanging about the establishments of great trainers in order to ascertain the condition of the horses. Underhand proceedings of some sort seem almost inseparable from horse-racing. The speculator who relies solely on his knowledge of horseflesh, and his observation of public running, must of course be something more than a mere amateur; but the amateur betting-men, who depend on calculation, or on secret information, are a very numerous class. It is to them that the turf does the greatest injury, and who repay the injury with interest. The professional betting man would, if racing did not exist, be a billiard marker, or a bill discounter, or an itinerant professor of roulette or thimblery. He is one of the class who live by the follies of mankind. Some inquiry into the habits and pursuits of this class, the sources whence they are recruited, their ultimate destiny, might perhaps be useful, but the topic is not inviting. The amateur betting man is as a general rule commercially employed: Manchester, especially, is a city in which the passion for such speculation is almost feverish. Clerks and warehousemen have seldom any intellectual pursuits of sufficient interest to compensate the monotony of their ordinary occupation; hence betting becomes their delight, as it furnishes them with intense excitement.

We have said that such persons base their speculations either on secret information or on calculation; but especially on the former. Those who supply it belong to the professional class; for a small fee they forward their opinion as to the probable winner of a race; and we believe that some among them are singularly accurate in their judgments, which are based partly on a fair comparison of one horse with another in public running, partly on the results of a system of espionage. Careful calculation is in reality far safer than reliance upon information: for, since the odds are almost invariably too favourable to the horses, a clever computer may make quite sure of winning. But good calculators are almost as rare as good poets; and when they do appear they should be turned to some better account than speculation on the turf. That department of mathematics which treats of probabilities has grown somewhat into disrepute from its possible misapplication; and Bishop Colenso, when dealing with its elements in his treatise on *Algebra*, warns the student against its application to gambling, not only on account of the dishonesty and selfishness which are thereby engendered, but especially because of the craving for unwholesome excitement which is inevitably produced.

The man who wins a wager receives money to which he has no right. He has given nothing for it. It is not the product of honest labour. This is the essence of its immorality. If A pays B fifty pounds when a certain horse wins the Derby, the transfer is as immoral, though not as dishonest, as if A were to drop the money, and B to pick it up.

and retain it. Money ultimately stands for human labour. It is, of course, obvious that every form of speculation for speculation's sake is equally immoral. A person who buys railway or mining shares, not for investment, but in the expectation that he will be able to sell at an advanced price, is simply laying a wager in another form. The vast growth of modern commercial enterprise facilitates such speculations. If, therefore, the turf were to become unpopular, men with a passion for excitement would easily find methods of satisfying it. At present, however, none is so simple or so fascinating as betting upon horses. The smallest sums may be invested in it; and races follow each other so rapidly that the excitement is continuous. It is painful to conjecture the amount of dishonesty and neglected duty which must be the result of the passion for betting among those young men of the mercantile classes who seem most addicted to it. They lose all healthy ambition, and are rendered callous to every sense of duty at the very outset of their career: and, if they escape the "run of ill-luck" which so frequently leads to poverty or dishonour, they at any rate never attain true manliness of character. Though engaged in trade, a man may be a Christian gentleman. Many such there are in England, and we have reason to be proud of them. But, when we hear of fraudulent trade-marks, of adulterated food, of days—as the indignant poet exclaims—

"When only the ledger lives, and when only not all men lie,"

we are prone to suspect that the unnatural excitement which is sought by our younger commercial men is not the least among the causes of a low mercantile morality.

It is not easy to propose remedies for this state of things. The working-man, even in great cities, is usually more amenable to reason than the clerk or shopman. His healthy physical toil gives him manliness; he marries younger, and is thus improved by female influence; he has no need to dress ostentatiously or to court the society of his superiors. No class has so many difficulties to encounter as the commercial class; for, while their occupation is monotonous, if not sordid, their education is inferior to the position which they desire to take, and affords them no resources which might make them independent of others. It will often be found that the artisan is a student of botany, or geometry, or languages: and the man who has once experienced the delight which intellectual labour affords will seldom crave unhealthy excitement. To those who seek such excitement we can only offer advice—can only indicate to them how perilous is their position, how foolishly they are wasting their lives. There seems no way in which the patrons of the turf can discourage this amateur betting. If the owners of great racing-stables were to withdraw from the pursuit—if it were no longer favoured by prime-ministers and great peers—it would only fall into the hands of men who would unscrupulously use it for plundering the public. Swindling would be the rule instead of the exception: and the only object in respect to which the pursuit can be defended—its effect upon the breed of horses—would be utterly ignored. We can well conceive what the turf would become if men like the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Derby, Lord Palmerston, withdrew from it, and its management fell to such persons as the one who "coopered" Old Calabar, or that other who spread the report, not unprofitably to himself, that Caractacus was dead.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

JULY 18.—News received at Shanghai from Jedo of another attempt to assassinate the British minister at that place. Two marines killed. The assassin committed suicide. The attempt supposed to have been instigated by the leading Damios.

August 9.—Battle of Cedar Mountain. Defeat of the Federals.

August 22.—The whole staff train of General Pope captured at Catlett's station—twelve miles to the rear of the Federal army and two miles from Warrenton station,—by 250 Confederate horsemen. According to a quarter-master's clerk, who was on the spot, they poured in unopposed, took complete possession of the camp, pillaged and plundered its personal effects, carried off the contents of all the trunks of General Pope and his staff, and carried with them on their retreat all the horses of the train, about 200, besides those belonging to the staff which were not in the field at the time. Some officers were in the camp, but General Pope and most of his staff were in front, twelve miles away. These horsemen distinctly knew what they were about, and made it their main business to seize Pope's papers, and those in the Adjutant-general and Quarter-master's office.

August 25.—Garibaldi lands during the night at Melito, near Capo di Spartivento, in Calabria.

August 27.—The *Journal de St. Pétersbourg* of to-day contains a circular note of Prince Gortschakoff, dated the 6th (18) of August, concerning the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy by Russia. Prince Gortschakoff says in this note:—"It is not only questions of right which are under consideration. It is monarchical principle and social order contending against revolutionary anarchy." The Prince then enumerates the guarantees given by King Victor Emmanuel, and adds:—"Under these circumstances we have thought it our interest to maintain and fortify the Cabinet of Turin on the ground of social order, and not to refuse our moral support to a Government chosen by the enlightened majority of a country towards which we entertain good will and sympathy." The minister concludes by saying:—"The Emperor neither raises nor resolves the question of right."

August 29.—Second battle of Bull Run. The Federals claim the victory, but are defeated the day after, and driven back upon Washington with great loss.

The fight at Aspromonte. Garibaldi wounded and taken prisoner by General Pallavicino.

August 30.—A telegram from Constantinople states that the Turks have taken Cetigne. Prince Nicolas and Mirko, with the Montenegrins, fled into Austrian territory, after setting fire to the principal buildings in the town.

September 6.—Death of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Mr. Bishop, the Englishman, arrested for conveying Bourbonist communications between Naples and Rome, sentenced to ten years' imprisonment.

September 8.—A serious conflict takes place at Nchiza between the Turks and Servians. Both sides suffer loss in killed and wounded.

September 9.—The conflict between the Turks and the Servians ends in the defeat of the former. An armistice since concluded through the intervention of the foreign consuls. The Turks surrounded in the fortress of Belgrade and their countrymen residing in the town unable to leave their houses. 170 warehouses and 130 houses in the Servian quarter set on fire by the Turks, and the remainder much damaged. The town nearly destroyed.

The Prince of Montenegro accepts all the conditions offered by Omar Pasha.

Betrothal of the Prince of Wales to the Princess Alexandra of Denmark at the Palace at Lacken.

September 10.—The treaty concluded between the Turks and the Montenegrins stipulates for the maintenance of the frontier as agreed upon in 1859; the cession of Granova to the Montenegrins; the exchange of deserters; and the opening of commercial relations between Montenegro and the adjoining Turkish provinces.

The *Wanderer* of Vienna publishes the following correspondence between Garibaldi and the United States' Minister at Vienna:—

"To General Garibaldi; Vienna, Sept. 1, 1862. General,—As you have for the moment failed in accomplishing the great patriotic work which you have undertaken in the interest of your beloved country, I take the liberty of asking you if it suits you to offer us your valiant arm in the struggle which we are maintaining for the liberty and unity of our great Republic.

"The combat we are waging does not interest us alone; it concerns the whole civilized world.

"The delight and enthusiasm with which you would be received in our country, where you have spent a portion of your life, would be immense, and your mission, which would be to lead our brave soldiers to fight for the same principle to which you have nobly devoted your whole life, would be fully conformable to your intentions.

"I should be happy, General, to have a reply from you.—I have the honour to be, &c., THEODORE CANISIUS, Consul of the U. S. of America."

"To M. Theodore Canisius, Consul of the United States at Vienna; Varignano, Sept. 14, 1862. Sir,—I am a prisoner and dangerously wounded; it is, consequently, impossible for me to dispose of myself. However, as soon as I am restored to liberty, and my wounds healed, I shall take the first favourable opportunity to satisfy my desire to serve the great American Republic, of which I am a citizen, and which is now fighting for universal liberty.—I have the honour to remain, &c., GARIBALDI."

REVIEWS.

Dickensism.*



R. DICKENS is at the head of a school of writers quite distinct from that of either Mr. Kingsley or Mr. Thackeray. He is more widely and universally popular than either of his rivals; mainly because he has wider sympathies, and addresses himself to a wider audience. He has no very special doctrine to preach, but that most public things, and institutions, and what may be called the broad machinery of life, want mending, always have wanted it, and will probably want it to the end. His great aim and resource is to be funny; and, taking his books as a whole, no modern author has ever possessed such an inexhaustible fund of fun, with no small amount of wit and humour. His wit, too, is of so broad and healthy a kind that it appeals to and reaches a host of readers widely differing in age, rank, tastes, and pursuits. All his writings can be and are relished without any special preparation. *Kingsley* is devoured by the whole school of muscular Christians, and read by thousands of outsiders who are half afraid of his doctrines, but charmed with the power, earnestness, and beauty of his style. *Thackeray* demands a certain amount of refinement, an educated taste, and the least tinge of love for morbid anatomy. But Dickens is everywhere welcome. He is so kindly, so graphic, so sunshiny,—and so sure to be funny—that write on what subject he will he seizes on our attention at once. It is no misfortune that he won't preach very much, but that when he attempts it he is sure to be dull. A didactic paragraph in his hands is as heavy as lead. Indeed he very rarely attempts this, and fails when he does so, mainly because he deals almost entirely with the surface of things, and the outsides of men and women. As long as you are content to take a walk through Babylon, look at the glare, show, folly, and sin of Regent-street, the dreary, dark despair of Gin-court, St. Giles'; peep into a debtor's prison, a penny theatre, a pawnbroker's shop, a ninepenny tea at Rosherville-gardens, or the convict hulk in the Thames, it is impossible to have for the mere surface a more amusing guide. With equal ease and equal success he can take you through the lions of *Little Pedlington*, St. Paul's, or a railway station; to see a crowd at Shripington, on the Sands, at the circulating library, or doing the pictures at the Exhibition. The worst of it is

that they are all painted with the same tone, the same manner, the very same brush, the same colours, from the same palette. You feel sure, as you listen to him, that your guide would take you anywhere you wish to go; but you are equally convinced that he would deal with the sausages at Mr. Snagg's the tripe-merchant, and Nelson's monument at St. Paul's in one and the same way. He is absolutely deficient in reverence and respect due to things greater and to things less. The sausages are beyond all praise. A butcher would instantly be able to tell their value per lb., by merely glancing at those two inimitable lines of description. While, as for the hero of the Nile,—you can positively see and feel the two cherubs of cold, smouchy marble, the tall individual with wings, the smirking Britannia, and the drowsy lions, but *Horatio Nelson* himself, you are convinced, is not there, either in body or in spirit.

If he attempts—for a moment—to leave this style, and look just below the surface of things, the chances are ten to one that he gushes off into a flash of sentimentalism, becomes maudlin, or morbidly dismal. One smells the "rosin" at once. The blue fire is coming; in a trice we shall hear the tinkle of the manager's bell. Up goes the curtain; scene a death-bed; warm atmosphere; little *Paul*, who has been dying all through the last two acts, is now about to slide up the two wires (invisible) into those beautiful clouds of silver gauze; three fairy-like angels hover above *the dying couch* (whatever that may be) to the right; while on the left are two kneeling figures in violent, though silent, hysterics, with two ditto standing, and convulsed with all the agony suitable to so interesting, so excruciating an occasion. Both these are feebly using their pocket-handkerchiefs (one fringed with lace, the other with plain edges, and spotted with pink dots); both saying the very properest things, and both devoutly casting their streaming eyes towards the neatest possible future monument in Kensal Green. This is nearly as good as going to the "Adelphi." So well is the whole thing done that we actually see poor little *Paul*, we hear the sobs, we feel the hot lachrymose air of the room, we know that it is all over with him; we wish that the flight up those airy wires was safely over, and he at rest with the two good sprites who have been waiting for him so long. But anything less like the solemnity or the reality of death, less like the passion of true grief, or of Christian hope; anything less like a death-bed *not* on the stage of the Adelphi, it would be hard to imagine. The boy of sixteen, when he comes to this, says, "*Oh! bosh,*" and goes on to the next page. His little sister, a girl of ten, cries over it copiously and thinks it so beautiful. But give the boy a death-bed scene out of the *Antiquary*, and he won't skip a word. His eyes would possibly be a little dim when he got to the end of the page; but he would read every word of it. He knows that little *Paul* will be all right directly up in the *Flies*, where he can still try to make out what *the wild waves are saying*; but, as for *Steenie Mucklebackit*, he is gone, gone for ever; he "will never come back to the town:"

"Though men must work and women must weep,
And the harbour-bar be moaning."

"Ye'll be a bra' fallow, Patie," says the father to his youngest child, "an ye be spared; but ye'll never, never can be what *he* was to me." This is real grief, and goes home to the heart at once, to the delight of school-boys, of old men, and maidens alike, if they have but a heart to feel. The other was a neat, sketchy, varnished picture of that patent kind warranted to draw, in a warm melodrama, being as much like the reality in life as stucco is to granite.

Dealing with the outside of men and things naturally leads Mr. Dickens to exaggeration. One does not perceive the exaggeration at first, because with infinite tact he has put his glasses before our eyes, and through them he makes us see as he sees, everything out of shape. This does not make much matter in some things, where the character is written on the surface.

But, when we come to apply this kind of description to living men and women,—we feel that we have got glasses

* 1. *Sketches by Boz*. 1838. 1 vol. Chapman and Hall.

2. *Dombey and Son*. By Charles Dickens 1854. 2 vols. Chapman and Hall.

3. *Great Expectations*. 1861. 2 vols. Chapman and Hall.

4. *The Collected Works of Charles Dickens*. 1861.

on, and begin to rub our eyes. For instance, here is the outline of a man's character :—

"He (*Mr. Klem*) never goes down the middle of a passage like another Christian, but shuffles against the wall, as if entreating me to take notice that he is occupying as little space as possible in his own house."

No one ever sees him going out or in, but he always "turns up with a *flat pint* of beer at half-past nine;" his daughter, a *Miss Klem*, "apparently ten years older than her parents," is described as having a "bed and smells of it, and carries it about the earth at dusk and hides it in deserted houses." The whole family possess the "power of converting everything into flue." This is funny, clever, vulgar, and graphic enough; but it is caricature and caricature alone. It makes us laugh only to read; it would make us laugh still more on the stage of the "Olympic," with *Robson* to take the part of *Miss Klem*; but it would not be one inch nearer life, and we should be convinced that no such human beings ever existed out of that magic scene where Mr. Dickens has placed them.

If we turn from such minor characters as these to our author's master-pieces, such as *Sam Weller*, *Mr. Pickwick*, or *Macawber*, we are still pursued by the same fatal deficiency. It is impossible to be wittier than *Sam*, more singular or more amusing than his master, or in a more ludicrous state of shipwreck than *Macawber*; but take them away from the scenes of the farce in which they appear, and they are veritable dummies. Inside the magic circle they act, and live, and move, and talk; outside they are as dead as one of the *fantocchini*. One of the most striking of modern writers, indeed, tells us that truth underlies Dickens' exaggeration, and that "allowing for his manner of telling the story he is always true to life; if he argues in a circle of stage-fire, he is not, therefore, to lose his wit." By all means let him have his reputation for wit and humour untouched, but exaggerated sketches of life are false sketches, and no available truth can underlie falsehood. The picture may amuse us, but as a work of art it fails. Far deeper is the failure, in a higher point of view, as an engine for moral teaching. A true picture of life, with its due proportion of light and shade, its virtue and villany, the wheat and tares growing together until the harvest, the splendour and the beauty, the ugliness and squalor, the sin and suffering, the righteousness and the peace, the joy and the misery,—all fairly drawn, have always a sound and healthy message. The more perfect and truthful the art with which it is painted, the higher the morality; the nearer its teaching to that which He who rules the world means that world to teach. Mr. Dickens tacitly ignores this truth by looking only at certain aspects of life, and throwing a veil of exaggeration over nearly the whole of them. He has a boundless range of fancy, and an overflowing store of witty and humorous images always at command. Wit and fancy both run riot; and the result is the strangest mixture of truth and error that can be imagined. *Mr. Pickwick* is like no human being under the sun; he does things, and does them in a way which no sane person ever yet dreamed of doing. In the story, and under Mr. Dickens' guidance, all seems natural enough; but outside it, it is hopelessly absurd. In the story we expect *Mr. Pickwick* to get drunk, and be wheeled into the pound; to moralize as he there does; to be wheeled away again and to feel no disgrace; to introduce a couple of swindling adventurers without fear into the house of his best friends; to talk, as only he could talk, to the cabman about his horse's age and habits; to refuse to pay the costs in *Bardell v. Pickwick*, and to perpetrate the absurdities he does perpetrate. Such is the skill and power, the freshness and dexterity of the painter, that we see just what he sees, and as he wishes us to see it. But one glance off the page on to the crowded mystery of the world about us, and the illusion is destroyed. *Sam Weller*, in his way, is quite as inimitable. He has more fun and wit in him than all the menservants in Babylon put together ever had or ever will have; the very thought of his humorous dialogue makes us smile in the very driest and dreariest of half-hours. But that such a phoenix ever existed; that

jolly, old, fat coachmen ever talked as *Old Weller* talks and writes to his son, is an idea that never occurs to us.

The same truth applies, with more or less force, to all the stories, or sketches, and characters before us. Up to a certain point they are often true and admirably drawn; beyond that, they pass into the domain of farce or pantomime. The wonder is that our author having attempted so infinite a variety of character, especially among the middle and lower classes of life, has not made his pictures more disagreeable than they are; and in this, indeed, he gives us but another proof of his exceeding skill. He has a host of imitators, of course; but in their hands the mere trick of exaggeration, and a liberal use of *Box's* palette, simply make them ludicrous and offensive,—a fate which the least touch of genius always escapes.

As a proof that Dickens deals with very little more than the mere surface of things, we have but to recall the one fact that we remember almost all his chief or most amusing characters by some intensely humorous or grotesque description. *Mr. Carker* is little more than two rows of shining teeth; the *Dwarf* drinks boiling rum out of a pipkin; our most worthy friend *Captain Cuttle* is little more than "a hook," "the instrument," that says "stand by," "aye, aye, my lad," or, "when found make a note of it;" the *Raven* in *Barnaby Rudge* is far more like a human being than many a man in that story; *Toots* and *Mr. Dick* are merely dreamy shadows of the same mild lunatic that has no part or business in any story, and plays none in life; while *Mark Tapley*, and a dozen other such nonentities, simply inform us that "it's jolly." All these and scores of other grotesque absurdities stand out brightly and clearly before us, by the sheer skill of the author, the keenness of his vision, and his command of words; as indeed do all the kettles, the clocks, the houses, and the umbrellas, that talk by the hour together. But it is not so in real life. Two rows of shining teeth, *there*, are no guide to a man's character. We gain nothing by being told that *Mr. Rinks* "was a thin man behind a shirt-collar;" that his friend whistles "an overture on the triangle;" or, that *Mr. Jefferies* "resided between two long ears." *Oliver Cromwell* had a wart on his nose, *Mr. Klem* carried a "flat pint of beer" (whatever that may be), *Nelson* had but one arm, *Diogenes* squinted in one eye, *Wilberforce* had a mole on his left leg; but neither the republican, the lodging-house-keeper, the admiral, the philosopher, nor the philanthropist is to be known by any one of these peculiarities. Their greatness, if they had any, lay elsewhere. Why then should *Todgers* be known by his shirt-sleeves, *Major Gunstock* by his mutton-chop whiskers, *Carker* by his teeth, or *Mr. Dawdle* by a lisp? Why should a man, if he have a heart, be drawn in a gush of maudlin sentiment, or if he have not, by a dash of caricature? Any given grocer is not simply an entity that sands his sugar, but a living man; with feelings, passions, emotions, as strong and as real as the pet workman or the pet young lady who goes into hysterics over the real or imaginary evils of life at the crisis of the story. Life is not made up of an infinite series of small jokes, little patches of fun, or of impossible contradictions. Talk to be amusing need not necessarily be slang. It is an ill service which Mr. Dickens has done to make our boys and girls, our young gentlemen and our young ladies, think that they cannot be lively without talking slang. The world is still the world in which men are acting, speaking, and suffering for another and truer life,—either for good, or for evil;—and the picture which wholly omits this view of the subject is radically false and untrue.

How partial and imperfect is Mr. Dickens' knowledge of men and women, or in some points how deadened his power of perception by continual thirst after the ludicrous, is apparent from the one fact that his highest idea of a gentleman is *Sir Leicester Dedlock* in *Bleak House*, or *Cousin Feenix* or *Lord Verisopht*: it is not too much to say that he has never grasped the notion of what an English gentleman or an English lady is. But he has devoted himself, with a pertinacity unlike the general kindness of his character, to make English gentlemen and English ladies hateful, or ludicrous, or contemptible, and, as a class, in-

ferior to every other class. Again, every picture he attempts to draw of love, or love-making, is simply and absolutely ludicrous. Of these, and all his other deficiencies, as well as of his endless vivacity, his skilful wit, his keen perception, his broad caricature, his faithful accuracy, his unwearied goodnature and power of amusing the reader, we might, if space permitted, give abundant and amusing examples. But he is too well known to need advertisement; and too widely admired to need praise. Ours has been an invidious task; that of trying to show why a master of English fiction has not done greater and better things. He has failed mainly because he has been carried away by the passion and tide of the moment, by his love of what is quaint, grotesque, sensational, and humorous; by forgetting that which is broadly human, and appliesto every age, in what is local, temporal, and evanescent. To be able to describe all the knockers down one side of a street, and up the other, is a wondrous gift; to be able to describe one human heart, with all its strange mixture of good and evil, its laughter and tears, its shade and sunshine, is infinitely greater. The world is *not* made up of funny streets, grotesque men, mysterious knockers, paralytic houses, or semi-lunatics. It is useless for Mr. Dickens to preach that it is. Mrs. Partington was excellent at her broom; but the Atlantic was too much for her. It will be too much for any one who sets out to view life only on its humorous side. From this vice our author's earliest book is comparatively free. This is his volume of *Sketches*, written about the year 1836. Their main force is spent on streets, and things external; but they are full of vigour, and of kindly feeling, and will be famous when some of his later and more "spasmodic" books are forgotten. It is too late, now, to hope that he will give us a story with a real plot in it, or in which the characters will do more than walk in, say their say, and retire. But, it is not too late to hope that he will give his brain time to rest and to meditate a while; that he will with iron hand tear away some of the extravagances of his style, and the eccentricities of his observation, leave off spectacles, and stick more closely to human nature in its plainest, simplest, elements. The many admirable sketches he has drawn, the humour and the beauty of many single groups, his power of observation, his freedom from bitterness, and his love of sunshine, will, we hope, yet culminate in a more profound and truthful picture of human life than he has yet given us. For this we wait.

Perry's Church History.*

ANY work that helps to show us how the English Church struggled through the Great Rebellion must always command respect. Not that volumes professing to be histories of that stormy period are by any means scarce, but they are too often the work of partizans, more eager to uphold a favourite theory than to proclaim the truth. This reproach, however, does not belong to Mr. Perry's *History of the Church of England*. Defective as it certainly is in some points, it is, nevertheless, an impartial exponent of the theology and temper of the times which it chronicles. Its author may fairly say with Shakespeare:—

"While others fish with craft for great opinion,
I with great Truth catch mere simplicity;
Whilst some with cunning gild their copper crowns,
With truth and plainness I do wear mine bare."

Mr. Perry sets about his task in a spirit of thorough impartiality, and this alone would give a charm to his book. So free is it from party bias that it would be hard to say whether High Church or Low Church might most justly claim the author. This may sound like doubtful praise; but it is not every one who can hold the scales so

evenly as that a spectator, gifted with only the ordinary share of common sense, can tell when the beam begins to descend on either side. Most compilers of history think it only fair trading to throw in a good-sized lump of home manufacture to increase the weight of their saleable commodities; but Mr. Perry knows nothing of such huckstering. He gives fair weight for the money, and if the purchaser does not like a good wholesome article, he can easily find places where a sickly counterfeit is sold.

The present volume, then, is what it represents itself to be—a *history*, and that is no light praise. Lord Macaulay has given us a specimen of literary sleight-of-hand. It is marvellous how a little skilful manipulation can conjure away awkward facts, and transport historical truth into the region of romance. He has proved himself the very Wiljalba Frikell of authors. And, of course, he will always have his humble imitators. The lion is scarcely dead but a score of asses are quarrelling over his skin. Any writer, therefore, who can be induced to content himself with something like an honest statement of facts, and the deductions which may fairly be drawn from them, if he does not come up to the popular notion of a historian, will at least command the respect of every thoughtful man.

This honesty of purpose, however, which distinguishes Mr. Perry, makes a certain amount of dryness inevitable. When an author writes a series of short novels, which he strings together, and, for want of a better name, calls them history, he must be but a dull fellow if he cannot make his book amusing. With the spice-box in his hands, the dish may be flavoured to suit any palate. But if he feels bound to place a limit to his fancy, and make his narrative bear some sort of resemblance to what actually did take place, a certain heaviness ensues, the reader begins to yawn, and the book is voted a bore. And the reason is obvious. No life, whether public or private, is a continued course of brilliant effects. We must be prepared to find the dull monotony of every-day business side by side with stirring incident, and any author who picks out the one, and leaves the other, may be very well qualified to write a "sensation" drama, but he had better let history alone.

But while Mr. Perry scorns to sacrifice truth in order to make his book amusing, he does not always turn his materials to the best account. In some of his portraits there is a feebleness of expression and want of tone, while in none of them is there that finish that marks the careful and laborious artist. And this is the less excusable when we remember what a gallery of worthies might have been collected from the Restoration age. Juxon, Sanderson, Cosin, Sancroft, Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, South, and Thorndike are names which have passed into household words. All of us would prize a life-like portrait of any one of them. But here Mr. Perry altogether fails. The greatest characters in his hands become commonplace. His way of treating them, however, shows enough of artistic skill to make us wish that he had spared more time and space to this important portion of his subject. Few can ever hope to become historical portrait-painters on a grand scale; but any one who has Mr. Perry's ability may with care and study produce likenesses much more worthy of the originals.

The second instalment of the *History of the Church of England* commences with the opening of the Long Parliament in 1640, and brings us at once to the most unhappy days of Charles I. If the past is a mirror of the future, attempts in our days to Puritanise the Church may well give a melancholy interest to this dreadful page of history. There are not a few things among us which have their precedent in days when ministers were ejected from their livings and sent forth to beg their bread for no higher offence than railing off their communion table or bowing at the Holy Name. The root-and-branch work, inaugurated by the Presbyterians and completed by the Independents, is well described by Mr. Perry, and the account which he gives of the state of England under the Directory is as awful as it is true.

* *The History of the Church of England, from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time.* By the Rev. George G. Perry, M.A. Vol. II. Saunders, Otley, and Co. London, 1862.

But there are special and urgent reasons at the present time for studying this Reign of Terror. Some Nonconformists are collecting all their energies to celebrate the memory of their "Confessors" of 1662. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the Act of Uniformity, let people stop to inquire a little into the facts of the case. On the one hand it is simply foolish to affirm that the preachers ejected in 1662 were the type of modern Dissenters. No affirmation is more groundless. On the other hand it is hard to realize—God grant we may never know by experience—what the state of England must have been when bishops were hiding and priests were forbidden to teach in churches or in schools; when the Prayer-book was banished as an abomination and when such men as Sanderson, Taylor, and Bull avoided proscription only by putting their books out of sight and repeating the Offices from memory. And yet when better times returned the usurping ministers were not thrust out of the livings into which they had been so unjustly intruded. No violence was done to their persons or goods. They were called upon to subscribe the Act of Uniformity; to express in this way their conformity to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England; and, failing such subscription, their benefices were declared to be vacant. Never in the history of the world were men treated with larger forbearance.

Upon the whole Mr. Perry's work contains much valuable information on the character of the great Puritan outbreak at the Rebellion. But while we bear a ready testimony to the accuracy of his facts, we must at the same time say that there are statements in which we cannot concur. We have no desire, however, to press these points, in the face of so much that is good. The book deserves to be widely read; and when it is supplemented by an index, it will be a necessary addition to every student's shelf.

Life of Lord Bacon.*

MONG the numerous disservices rendered to literature by Lord Macaulay not the least must be accounted the rhetorical and superficial style in which he has handled the reputation, personal and philosophical, of Francis Bacon. The prevailing notion of Lord Bacon's character, among the ordinary portion of the reading public of England, would be found to be probably no more than an echo of Macaulay's famous essay. The brilliant recklessness with which the writer interprets every fact in the great philosopher's history, so as to confirm his own foregone conclusion, the forcible invective with which his name is vilified, and, above all, the assumption of an overwhelming knowledge of the subject which the essayist was very far from really possessing, have combined to hurry his readers into a hostile opinion which it will be long ere the labours of more patient, but less dashing scholars will be able to shake or modify. And moreover Bacon, having had the misfortune to be Lord High Chancellor of England, suffered the consequent mishap of having his life written by an author less brilliant and more superficial than Macaulay, but who, like Macaulay, wrote for the many and has had a large audience. The late Lord Campbell's biography of his most illustrious predecessor on the woolsack confirms the slanders of Macaulay, and spreads yet wider a shallow estimate of Bacon's character and life. But the mischief does not end here. The ungenerous accusations called forth an advocate and defender whose pleading has proved more damaging than the accusations themselves, and we can scarcely doubt that Mr. W. Hepworth Dixon's superficial reply leaves a much more unsatisfactory impression of Bacon's life than the superficial attacks of Campbell and Macaulay. Happily, we now possess an opportunity

of judging from authentic sources what Bacon's life really was, distorted neither by the ungenerous bitterness of rhetorical assailants, nor the well-meant feebleness of an incompetent defender. We wish very briefly to point out the present aspect of the controversy, and to show what is being done in vindication, partially at least, of the fair fame of one of the wisest and most illustrious of mankind.

We may begin by noticing in a few words the drift and purport of Mr. Dixon's volume. Starting from a psychological principle, which must appear ludicrously untenable to everybody but Mr. Dixon himself, who may claim whatever merit belongs to its discovery, that "Nature abhors antitheses, and if she may make a god or devil, she will not put the two in one," he asserts that "Nature never yet made such a man as Macaulay paints." Mr. Dixon's meaning in this proposition is that wisdom of intellect and meanness or vice of character are never found in combination—as shallow and palpably absurd a doctrine as was ever propounded. Why, nearly every man we meet is more or less of an antithesis and a contradiction. We can scarcely call to mind a single illustrious name which does not suggest antithesis of character more or less violent. Take Goëthe, Burns, Cicero—all instances of this combination of intellectual power with moral weakness. Mr. Dixon, in borrowing the form of an ancient and exploded axiom in physics, has produced an axiom equally untrue in ethics, and which is only not exploded because it has never before been advanced. Having taken this as a kind of basis for his theory, he asks us to judge Bacon's life in its entirety; "small facts may be true, broad facts must be true." If Mr. Dixon had spent his time in laborious research, such as Mr. Spedding has pursued, instead of wasting it in the concoction of these false or meaningless aphorisms, he would have rendered a much greater service to the cause of which he was the voluntary advocate. His argumentation is based upon these *a priori* grounds, when it should have been supported by absolute facts. He has attempted fine writing where we wanted hard reading; and where we looked for facts and documents we are regaled with much foolish talk about Nature's "forks never flashing from a blue vault," and her waves not ceasing "to crest when the wind which whipped them lulls." We must do Mr. Dixon the credit to admit that he has placed the general argument for Bacon's integrity of character in a strong light. As he says, "in front of all detail a general question must be put," namely, "how came it that whilst men of undoubtedly inferior power to Bacon secured important and lucrative offices in the State, he who was more learned, more thoughtful, and more eloquent than any or all of these, was left behind in the race for promotion? How came it that Coke became Attorney-general at the age of forty-two, while Bacon, on obtaining the same office, was ten years older? Burnley was Lord Chancellor at forty-seven; Bacon was fifty-seven when he was appointed to the seals. Again, Bacon was not only later in getting preferment than men of inferior merit, but he made less use of its opportunities when within his reach." But this argument, however well put, must not be taken for more than it is worth. That Bacon was unsuccessful is no proof that he did not deserve to be so; he would not be the only man who has discovered that meanness and servility are frequently less sure means of procuring advancement and gaining their own end than a stern integrity. The chief force in this argument is as a preliminary to an investigation of facts, and as tending to mitigate any prejudice with which we might be disposed to open or conduct that investigation. If Bacon was servile and selfish, at all events he did not attain his object. On the whole, we acquire a very fair idea of the worth of Mr. Dixon's book from observing the tranquil contempt with which Mr. Spedding, a scholar of a very different stamp, treats his labours on the only occasion when he thinks it worth while to refer to them, and when by the way it is for the purpose of correcting an error (vol. i. p. 386). As a writer in the *Quarterly Review* remarked some years ago, "it is one of the be-

* 1. *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon.* By Francis Spedding. Vols. I. and II. Longman and Co. 2. *Personal History of Lord Bacon.* By William Hepworth Dixon. Murray.

setting sins of modern historians to start with some preconceived idea, and to make all events fall in with their imaginary notions." Precisely in this way has Mr. Dixon sinned; and he has sinned still more in a point on which most modern biographers are little open to accusation—he has not taken the proper pains to acquire all the material calculated to throw light upon his subject.

This constitutes one prime point of difference between his own careless and ill-written book and the laborious and scholarly work of Mr. Spedding, the first two volumes of which are now before us. This first instalment of the *Letters and Life of Bacon* cover all that is known of him from his twentieth year—the date of his first letter being 1580—down to the trial and condemnation of the Earl of Essex. It will be in accordance with our purpose if, passing over much that is of great interest and forbearing to transcribe any account of the way in which Bacon lived during these weary years of embarrassment and failure, we proceed at once to consider Mr. Spedding's view of Bacon's conduct in the important Essex episode, of which so much use has been made in traducing his character. Mr. Dixon's defence of Bacon in this matter may be briefly summed up thus:—Essex had no claim upon Bacon's gratitude, because but for his impetuosity and rashness the Queen would have made Bacon Solicitor-general, and she did violence to her own favourable inclination towards Bacon in order to punish his patron;—the estate which the Earl is said to have given to Bacon, by way of compensation for the disappointment he had just suffered, was no gift at all, but a land payment to "his lawyer or man of political business;"—Essex came up from Wanstead for the express purpose of getting his name put on the committee hostile to two bills for whose safe carriage Bacon was anxious, thus showing that there was a serious estrangement between the two;—Elizabeth, meanwhile, had been showering favours on Bacon, and when it came to a downright issue between the Queen and the Earl, Bacon was more bound by gratitude to her than to his former patron. Mr. Spedding's work, which is an edition of Bacon's writings and not a specific defence of Bacon's conduct, does not enter into this question so directly and fully. After furnishing all the material which can possibly bear upon the controversy, and elucidating its full meaning, the editor leaves the reader to arrange it as he will with reference to the accusations against Bacon. He says that for himself he has no fault to find with Bacon for any part of his conduct to Essex; closer examination only confirms his opinion; and he cannot think that any of the objections which have been urged against Bacon's conduct in this matter would naturally suggest themselves to a reasonable person in reading the story as he has told it. He promises, however, that he will have to return to the subject in connection with the *Apology*—a work belonging to a later period. The mass of documents bearing upon the trial, and the tone in which Mr. Spedding shows that we ought to interpret them, are arguments more conclusive and irrefragable than any amount of direct objection and answer. We see that the zeal against Essex, which is said to have been more than would have been justifiable towards a mere stranger, was no more than the upright discharge of professional or official duty, and that what has been called an exertion of his professional talents to shed the Earl's blood was only the proper performance of the duty which he had not sought for, but which devolved upon him by the Queen's command. Then the *Declaration*, which Macaulay and others seem to regard as a deliberate and gratuitous attempt on Bacon's part "to blacken the Earl's memory," is shown, from Bacon's own account of it, to have been drawn up by him in accordance with a command from the Queen; he received minute instructions from her as to the mode of its construction; the draft was amended by the principal councillors, and finally corrected by the Queen herself, the effect of her alterations, according to Mr. Spedding, being "apparently to impart to the composition a somewhat harder and colder tone than he had given, or than he liked." Mr. Spedding confesses

himself unable to say what impression this *Declaration* made upon the public at the time of its appearance, but is of opinion that "it had its effect probably in satisfying impartial minds of the then living generation." So far as we can judge from all that is known of the contemporary history, Macaulay's assertion that Bacon's conduct excited at the time great and general disapprobation, though prefaced by the phrase "it is certain," is entirely devoid of accuracy, and resulted from a confusion between the popular sentiments at the time of Essex's execution, and that which was entertained some twenty years after, when the unpopularity of the Spanish match threw a halo of glory round every name conspicuous for hostility to Spain, and Essex became the representative of the popular cause. Essex, in the words of Mr. Spedding, "reappeared in all the colours of romance, the invincible captain in whose face nothing Spanish could ever stand; the patriotic councillor whose patriotism had brought upon him the hatred of wicked men, who by malicious intrigues and false accusations pursued him to death; the true narrative sinking by necessary consequence into a slanderous libel." But though this explanation is tolerably satisfactory, future historians or biographers may, perhaps, be able to furnish a more direct account of what the feeling of the public at the time really was, and how far it censured Bacon or cleared him of any undue acrimony or excess of duty in the conduct of the trial. This would be the true test. It is not fair to condemn him by the standard of our own age; neither, on the other hand, will any amount of special pleading secure his acquittal if those who were immediately contemporary to the transaction pronounced against him.

Mr. Spedding's labours enable us to furnish several instances of Macaulay's bold method of dealing with facts. Macaulay in his usual brilliant style tells us that Bacon rose very rapidly into business, and soon entertained hopes of being called within the bar. Mr. Spedding, on the other hand, shows from authentic sources that the strongest argument against Bacon's pretensions to the office of Attorney-general lay in his want of practice. His enemies said that "he had never entered the place of battle." Whether this want of practice arose from his not being able to find clients, or from his not caring to seek them, is uncertain. Neither is the question of any serious interest, but it serves to illustrate how much easier it is to dash off a smart sentence than to discover and state simple facts. Again, in reference to the letter to the Lord Keeper, which, according to Macaulay, "may keep in countenance the most unmanly of the epistles which Cicero wrote during his banishment," Mr. Spedding shows that its whole tone is that of justification and not of apology. But we have not space for the exposure of all the misrepresentations that are made to the reader by means of this epigrammatic and allusive style. Mr. Spedding's two volumes furnish most adequate materials for such an exposure. It will be soon enough to attempt a new and a fairer estimate of Bacon when Mr. Spedding's labours are finished, and the *Letters and Life* are complete. There will then be room for some second Macaulay to instruct the public in Bacon's character, and to show the converse of the dark portrait which now passes current for his likeness.

The Public Life of Lord Macaulay.*



EXT to a bad character a bad biographer is about the worst thing a man can leave behind him. Mr. Arnold's services were freely supplied, and he can have no reason fairly to object to their being as freely criticised. But if he has not brought much judgment to the work, he has at any rate laid under contribution a great deal of enthusiasm; and on the whole perhaps the memory of Lord Macaulay will be put to a harder trial than will the indulgence of those

* *The Public Life of Lord Macaulay.* By the Rev. Frederick Arnold. Tinsley.

who may take up this volume. It seems that Mr. Frederick Arnold has been in the habit of contributing articles to literary papers, and had the bad luck to get them printed in a journal that could not be got to live long after. We do not mean to say that his essays had any tendency to induce mortality; here they are again in an octavo that it is presumed will live; but he liked them so well himself that he was sure they came to journalism too late to relieve it, and that if they were properly re-introduced they would be heard of again to advantage. But it is due to Mr. Arnold himself to say that, whilst he is rather fond of them, he is quite conscious that the matter might have been handled a great deal better. He waited for the sort of public life to appear of Lord Macaulay that appears of most public men, good, bad, and indifferent. There was nothing, however, but a great silence. So Mr. Arnold seized his scissors and his paste, and from the corpse of the *Literary Gazette* cut the chief part of this volume. We do not so much complain of the cuttings, as that they were ever cut. We should have thought it might very well have occurred to this gentleman that the silence of Lord Macaulay's friends and parasites was a very suggestive commentary on his whole public life. He might have been very sure that if they had had anything to say that would have put Lord Macaulay's public life in a better public position, they would have said it. Mr. Arnold must see, or he should see, that he has done the very worst thing he could for the memory of the man he reverences with perfect sincerity. He has made people ask, who had no mind to ask it before, how it comes to be that, after a suspicious pause, the office of keeping the memory of Lord Macaulay's public life agreeably conspicuous has become centred in the papers that went down with the wreck of an unhappy print. People will ask, "Where are those who stood round the bier at Poet's Corner? Where the statesmen—where the men of letters?" The truth is, in getting this question at all properly answered, Mr. Arnold has made himself responsible for a great deal. Like a man who came honestly to his work, he seems to know it; but though he believes his work to be very poorly done, and whilst most people will applaud his frankness, and not disturb his estimate, the book, if it is too often a mere unmixed panegyric, is not on the whole at all a useless contribution. But it is too big; and the writer's style has not caught much of the fascination of his hero. But after all, what is there of Lord Macaulay's public life that had better not be forgotten? Could he but have made himself heard before the fervour of Mr. Arnold's allegiance, it may be conceived that he would have said, "My work was to revivify the Whigs and to destroy the Church connection. I don't seem to have succeeded. Let me alone." Perhaps if Mr. Arnold's zeal had not found any one to publish it, in the course of things it might have been forgotten that no public man that ever lived has left behind him so unmanageable a memory as has Lord Macaulay; it is not likely that even that of Lord Russell himself will suffer much more by a close analysis. But here, when everybody seemed disposed to be silent about it, when the Conservative reaction was declaring the hopelessness of any Whig revival, and when every sign of the times confirmed the weakness of Lord Macaulay's appeal in behalf of the "Liberals," Mr. Arnold is not to be restrained from challenging a verdict in his idol's favour. The truth is that Lord Macaulay debauched the people of this country for a number of years by the showy periods that he set out before them. It was clear enough to him that whatever he wrote they would read. Under these circumstances he was very well worth retaining; and the Whigs retained him. But it is hardly too much to assume that Lord Macaulay, with all his brilliancy, never quite persuaded any one to think better of the Whigs—not even Mr. Frederick Arnold; at least the results of his advocacy do not anywhere appear on the face of events. The public life of Lord Macaulay has left just one of those memories that neither friend nor parasite, until the present, has cared to touch. He was hired by a party. He was

about worthy of his hire; but it does seem to us to have been a very great mistake to set all the world thinking again over the terms. The Whigs had used him; they had made him a Peer for the way he wrote against the Tories; but posterity—if ever this volume shall be carried down to guide it—is not likely to look on the partisan as the historian, or to appreciate, on public grounds, Lord Macaulay's title to Westminster Abbey. Mr. Arnold himself will scarcely assert that Lord Macaulay would have got a hearing if his sentences had been less taking, and his libels had been less gaudily set out. Everybody has read his history, but nobody *as* history. As it has been well said, "It is repudiated at Oxford, and not sanctioned at Cambridge—the universities of the English world have condemned it." The worthlessness of the offering was unanswerably pointed out in the *Times*, and Lord Macaulay's ignorance was often so transparent that even Mr. Hepworth Dixon was able by himself to indicate it. And yet this history was the work of Lord Macaulay's life. It became light reading at young ladies' schools after a chapter in Hume had been just tolerated, and they read it through without missing any—and what has become of it now? What error that might have been made worse by time has it not confirmed? What did it ever proclaim? An eternity of Whiggism as the only possible hereafter and yet before the patent of his peerage was hardly made out, the decomposition of "Liberalism" had fairly begun. He not only failed to show that the Whigs had been full of innocence; but he was unable to secure for their present succession a treasury bench full of cousins. It is true enough that, like those fictions of which they are a sect, what he wrote has been cheapened and still sells; but Mr. Arnold's volume has only made us remember of the man who was to have whitewashed the Whigs of the past, that when he began to scrape them they were so discoloured that he found he could not get off the distemper, and also that he hardly survived their complete catastrophe.

Lord Macaulay was in truth about the last man to write history at all. It is indeed very probable that the man who wrote for a party will at the present be much more thought of than the man who writes for posterity; and it is perhaps only after reading Mr. Arnold's work that it is possible to understand how little Lord Macaulay's influence, other than as a pamphleteer, will be felt by the hereafter. We do not suppose that Mr. Arnold intended this to be the chief result of reading his book; but if it shows—as it clearly does—how very unreliable Lord Macaulay always was, the benevolence of reintroducing these papers is sure to be acknowledged. Nor is Lord Macaulay's influence on events the more likely to be admitted when his sneers at the Church party are contrasted with the paramount influence adjudged to all Church questions just now in Parliament. Mr. Andrew Stewart indeed tells us that the Church is getting so great an ascendancy that he cannot bring himself to stop in Parliament to see her supremacy confirmed. As Lord Macaulay's adoration of the Whigs was answered by the demoralisation of "Liberalism," his panegyrics on the Puritans and on the Providential interposition of William III. are just now replied to by a Church revival throughout the land. Perhaps after all Mr. Arnold will deserve to be better thanked for his reminder of all this than he will be. The country will be able to feel that it can read Lord Macaulay's volumes without being asked to feel that it is doing more than playing with history; that his hatred for the Tories has borne fruit in a great constitutional revival; and that the same generation that crowded round the inauguration of his "history," has busied itself already with exposing its worthlessness. As a book, Mr. Arnold's volume is very much beneath its subject, and a great many people will ask, "Is this the best thing that could be done for Lord Macaulay?" No matter: some purposes will at least be served. It tells us something of the life of Lord Macaulay at Cambridge, of his visit to India, and of his return, of his parliamentary career and speeches, some of which are given; and this is all. But the history of the time in which Lord

Macaulay figured shows that Mr. Arnold has got out of his depth where he might easily enough have found footing. There is nothing of the kind, however, besides, and we don't suppose there ever will be. Events have been too damning for Lord Macaulay's friends to think of publishing against them; and the least harm to his memory perhaps has come of the work being done by one who knew no secrets, and nothing of the bargain that there must have been; who had nearly nothing new to tell, and perhaps still less to withhold. Mr. Arnold, it must be said, clearly does not mean to be a parasite; he always means to be very fair: and whilst his intentions are beyond all reproach, it is the more pity that his good faith and his style have not arranged to be on better terms.

Kirche und Kirchen, Herr Von Dollinger.



HERE is," said Professor Döllinger, in a lecture delivered early last year at Munich, "no doubt of the right of the Pope to govern his own States, and no doubt also of the frauds and injustice perpetrated against him; but the Papacy existed for centuries before the popes ruled a single village, and the great fathers of the Church have never seen an advantage or excellence in the union of the highest ecclesiastical authority with a temporal kingdom, but only something required of the necessities of the times." And after quoting Bellarmine to this effect, he goes on to say "that the union of secular and spiritual power is in the present state of Europe intolerable; that it is impossible for the Papal government to satisfy the desires of its subjects, and that consequently, being dependent upon foreign troops, it affords the sad spectacle of the weakest and most helpless government in Europe." The sensation produced by the lecture, of which the substance is contained in the above quotation, was immense; to understand which, it must be borne in mind that strong convictions, intolerance of difference of opinion, and a strange unanimity on all subjects of general interest, are characteristic of the Southern German; and that, though not easily roused, his strong conservatism, his traditional and mediæval loyalty to the Emperor of Austria and the Pope, his attachment to his religion, and his fear of Louis Napoleon, had combined in the winter of 1860 and 1861 to excite him almost to frenzy, and had rendered any sympathy with the cause of Italian liberty both treason and heresy in his eyes.

If, indeed, an ordinary man had expressed such opinions, the audience would have been very angry, and no more would have been thought about it. Döllinger was, however, a priest known for his devotion to the Roman Catholic Church, at the same time one of its most famous divines, and a distinguished professor and author. On an abstract of the lecture shortly after appearing in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Bavaria may be almost said to have been stupefied with amazement; and from Vienna to the Rhine the lecture became the subject of universal comment. Its effect, however, was on the laity chiefly astonishment, and as respects the clergy, certainly not satisfaction. The first meagre and incorrect report of it offended the one without convincing the other, and it became absolutely necessary for Döllinger to do something. The course he took was a singular one. He writes a book containing an elaborate attack on Protestantism, and on the Church of England, the vigour and evident sincerity of which is calculated to re-establish his own loyalty to his Church, to conciliate those he had offended, and also to ensure the popularity of the work, and concludes with a history and review of the States of the Church, in which he defends the position taken in his lecture by overwhelming evidence. The artifice has at least partially succeeded. The book has been read; and had an effect perhaps even greater than the author intended.

We may blame him for rendering his book acceptable to his co-religionists by an utterly irrelevant criticism of ourselves, which is not only hostile, but in some respects unscrupulous. In this criticism lies, however, the value of the book to us; and though it does not give a correct or impartial description of Protestant Christianity in general, and of the Church of England, there is this excuse to be made for the author's inaccuracy, that he has the mind of a philosopher, not of an historian; that he has travelled little, and that his knowledge of the world is derived more from books than from observation. On the other hand, he has studied, with true German patience and depth, the weak points of Protestantism, and though his precise charges are often incorrect, they are never inconsistent or impossible. However exaggerated, they have a prophetic value; for the evil he describes exists in the germ; and his description applies wheresoever it arrives at maturity. He has divided the book into three parts; the first is a short general sketch of Christianity; the second, an account of the Christian churches and sects not in communion with the Church of Rome: this is by far the longest division; it is very complete, and the whole of it deserves the most careful study. The third part is a short history of the Papacy, with a fuller explanation of its present position and its prospects. Of this we will only say, that, though the evidence it contains of Papal misrule has convinced the majority of the German Roman Catholic laity that the temporal authority of the Pope cannot and ought not to exist any longer, yet if those who read it look to the authorities referred to, they will find the case against the Papal government far stronger than Döllinger thought it expedient to represent it. Omitting for the present all notice of the first division, we will only observe in respect to the sketch of the Eastern Churches, with which the second commences, that it recalls to the mind of the reader the light in which Protestants usually view the author's own Church, which is indeed to Eastern Christians but the first revolutionary and Protestant Church. There then follows an assault on the Church of England, which, together with the account of sectarianism in Great Britain and America, will form the most interesting part of the book to English readers. We did not of course expect a favourable account of ourselves, but we were not prepared for the intensity of dislike which is here revealed; and yet the criticism is written with such force and shrewdness, and such an appearance of fairness, that it is sure to colour German notions of the Anglican Church for many years to come. Of the many charges against it, three seem worthy of notice. The most serious of them is, that the Anglican is a fashionable religion, and the Church of the rich and not of the poor. This view is obviously derived from observations made in London and the large towns; and had it been confined to these, its justice would have struck home to the conscience of many members of the Church of England, who, after personal experience of the difficulty and expense of obtaining a seat in church, have already asked themselves, "What then becomes of the poor?" The Church of England is afterwards accused of having no fixed doctrine. "It is very characteristic that the whole Anglican Church cannot show a single system or manual of doctrine." The thing here intended is not true. If Professor Döllinger had said that the Church of England has no system or doctrine other than the Primitive Church had; and no manual other than the Prayer Book and the Articles, the remark would have been correct; but then it would not have served the purposes of the imputation.

Professor Döllinger finally attacks the Church of England in respect to what seems to him its bondage, and yet we gather from a description of the working of the Papal authority, in the first part of the book, that the royal supremacy practically confers on the Anglican Church the chief advantages derived in the Roman Catholic Church from the Papacy; for its rights are in that description deduced from its usefulness rather than from scriptural authority. The assertion of its divine foundation is only alluded to, and it is argued at some length that "everything endued with life must have a centre of union and communication,

a chief to hold the parts together ;" that "it results from the nature and structure of the Church that this centre must be a distinct personality;" and in accordance with this moderate view of the Papal authority, it is further argued that the Church derives from it not infallibility, but union, stability, and dignity. That the power of the Pope is not arbitrary, nor despotic, nor irresponsible, but limited and strictly defined ; that it stands between the people and the clergy, a check on the interference of the former, and the ambition of the latter ; and again, that the Papacy gives to all a sense of security ; that it is an august name, to which all willingly pay deference, which combines discordant functions, powers, and energies to a common end. This description will be most suggestive to all offended at the Royal Supremacy ; and if such men will apply its arguments to their own Church, they will pause before they seek to destroy that which cannot be replaced, which, if it seem to some unsound, is yet most useful, and at the same time powerless for evil, since only the apathy and neglect of the Church can render its arbitrary action possible.

A large portion of the second division of the book is taken up with a description of the sects in England and America. The rapid progress of Dissent in England is said to be "a splendid proof of the talent for organization inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race." The author seems to exult in the progress of disintegration to which he asserts it is subjecting the Episcopal Church. But his statements prove that sectarianism cannot supply the want of a State Church ; that its influence, such as it is, does not extend to the very poor in the great English cities, and that it has in America left a large proportion of the whole population belonging to no religious body whatsoever. For the benefit of those who suppose that religious peace in this country can be purchased by the surrender of the privileges of the Church, we translate from him the following extract from the *Mercesburg Review* :—"The whole world knows that the mutual relation of our sects is rather a relation of rivalry, opposition, and jealousy, than that of brotherly love and harmonious co-operation ; if it was said of the ancient Christians, see how they love one another, it holds of the present American Christians, see how they hate one another." His view of dissenting doctrine is substantially contained in the two following quotations :—"The practical Englishman wishes to have a doctrine which shall be pleasant, easy to be understood, comfortable and soothing, which shall flatter his inclinations, his predominant inclination, and self-satisfaction : all this he finds in the Calvinistic doctrine as understood and treated by the dissenting sects." To this talisman he ascribes their influence. Even the Wesleyans have, he says, been obliged to forsake the doctrines of their founder, and to teach Calvinism ; and speaking of the sects in America he says, "Willingly do men listen to the preacher, raising them above moral responsibility, while he preaches to them the three connected doctrines of absolute divine election, of total depravity, with utter moral impotence, and of forgiveness through mere imputation." In the following quotation respecting the Church in Scotland, a circumstance is mentioned to which sufficient attention has hardly been paid. He contrasts the richness of Dutch theological literature with the poverty of the Scotch, observing, "This is doubly strange in so highly gifted a people;" and adds, "Since the reformation Scotland has only had, strictly speaking, two important divines, Robert Leighton and Forbes, and both belonged to the Episcopal Church." The reason of this poverty undoubtedly is that the heart and intellect cannot expand when bound in Calvinistic fetters.

After an account of the other Continental Protestant communities, Professor Döllinger concludes the second division of his book with a very interesting criticism on Protestantism in Germany. He makes honourable mention of Luther, and speaks with evident pride of the performances of the modern schools of German divinity ; he allows them the credit of having expelled rationalism from the pulpit, but asserts that the religious revival had not reached the laity. This is too true, for the average German may be said to interest himself about few things,

and about religion least of all. His religious apathy is partly due to the character of the German service, of which the aim and object is not worship, but instruction ; that is to say, as our author explains it, "it is neither a liturgical service like the Anglican, nor like the Roman, 'a symbolical service,' 'an acted festival,' 'a practical celebration of the whole work of redemption, a communicating in the sacrifice of the last supper, in which all present take part, the self-sacrifice of the congregation together with Christ offering itself to God,'" but it consists of a lecture or sermon relieved by a few hymns and a few words of prayer. But it is chiefly owing to the character and parentage of German Protestantism, which is the child of governments and professors, and which has never expressed the religious thoughts and feelings, or possessed a permanent hold on the affections, of the nation. A reaction closely followed the excitement of the Reformation, and though a well-drilled clergy taught, in obedience to the command of princes, a symmetrical Lutheran or Calvinistic doctrine to the people, the result was but a cold and lifeless acceptance.—Religion at last died of inanition. So barren indeed did the religious mind in Germany become that it had not energy to produce weeds. Rationalism was there an imported plant ; but having no rivals it soon covered the land, and at present the clergy resemble, in more than one respect, missionaries in a heathen country. But though not generally popular, modern German theology is emancipating religion from the tyranny of those logical systems which for the last three centuries have been the curse of Protestantism. It is very interesting to observe how in Germany, the hotbed of systematic divinity, Romanists and Protestants have given up the extreme views once taught. The old doctrine of justification by faith only, for instance, is no longer really held by the one, nor the contrary doctrine by the other. "Protestants," says Döllinger, "now teach the Catholic doctrine of justification in Protestant phraseology, and as soon as one of them is compelled to explain the doctrine in scientific language, and the general phrases are insufficient, regularly appears the doctrine which the reformers and their genuine followers declared to be Papist and Arminian ;" and he finds fault with modern German Protestants for the way in which they speak of the righteousness of faith and imputation by faith, saying, "It happens to be the Catholic Church which teaches that man is found just before God through faith, which worketh by love ;" and he would fasten upon them the necessity of being true to the old Protestant doctrine—"That it is not faith, but the imputation of the merits of Christ which makes a man appear just before God ; that the process of justification is accomplished by God accepting Christ's sufferings and fulfilment of the law, as if he himself had rendered this obedience, and man through faith becomes conscious and sure of this imputation." The Protestants reply that neither does *he* teach the old doctrine of his Church, and the retort occurs to some of them that he has been emboldened by his success in breaking the ninth to attempt a breach of the eighth Commandment. Such a controversy is not unprofitable, for it instructs us how time and experience, assisted by more exact and critical study, have worn away the edge of the theological terms employed by either party, till both now teach the same doctrine in opposite language.

We here see an illustration of the opinion of Germany's greatest poet, that theological disputes deal with words rather than with things, and also a vindication of the liberality and moderation of the English Church. Much is said by Döllinger of the general, though vague, religious discontent pervading the Continent. In his opinion the numerous prophecies of a new pentecost, the millennium, and the near end of the world are signs that Protestants are not satisfied with the working of Christianity, that they are conscious that the kingdom of God has not yet come to them. But there are even plainer signs than these which he seizes upon. German poets, divines, and philosophers call the Romanist the Church of S. Peter, the Protestant Church that of S. Paul, and prophecy the Church of the future "the Church of S. John," of which it is generally assumed that it will combine what is good in

the old Churches. Döllinger, on the contrary, argues that "a fusion of the Catholic Church with the Protestant, so that the distinctive character of each should pass into the other, is impossible. For the essence of Catholicism and Protestantism are not related as the two sides of a thing, which mutually complete the other, and which, united, form a more rich and harmonious whole, but their relation is that of opposites, the one is the negation of the other." We have here before us the great religious problem which will perhaps occupy mankind for several centuries to come. As England has given to the world the solution of the great problem of government, it seems also destined to solve that of religion, and to prove that here, too, men may be logical overmuch, and that anomalies are not always bad things.

A. N. Welby Pugin.*



UGUSTUS Northmore Welby Pugin was one of the most eminent architects of modern times, and the first great revivalist of mediæval art in this country.

As to the merits of his peculiar school of architecture there may be two opinions. Mr. Ruskin has accused him of neglecting breadth and grandeur of design for highly-finished and elaborate detail; but to enter into this question is beyond our province. These *Recollections* of the Pugins are written by one who, having been a pupil of the father's and a life-long friend of the son's, may be expected to hold their name in the highest esteem and veneration. Himself an architect of no mean reputation, Mr. Ferrey can speak feelingly of the troubles, vexations, and disappointments which constantly arise to thwart the designs and damp the energies of the man of genius in his own profession; and he well knows how to estimate at its just value the courage and talent necessary to overcome these difficulties.

In Mr. Ferrey's opinion they were conquered by Welby Pugin, and he asserts that—

"Though scarcely reaching the middle age of man, Pugin yet lived to see the whole state of architecture revolutionized by the standard which he himself had raised."

Descended from an ancient French family, the elder Pugin was driven from his country during the terrors of the Revolution, barely escaping with his life.

In London, as a refugee and a friendless stranger, the position of "Monsieur Puggens," as he was called, was by no means an enviable one. But he was fortunate enough, through the medium of an advertisement, to obtain employment in the office of Mr. Nash the architect.

Here, in consequence of his original and beautifully-executed designs, Augustus Pugin rose in his profession, and he afterwards published several interesting illustrated works, and became an authority on Gothic Architecture.

In course of time Pugin married a Miss Welby,—a very clever and sensible woman, who seems to have kept her household (her husband included) in the strictest possible order.

Augustus Welby Pugin, their only child, was born in London in 1812. From an early age he evinced an extraordinary talent for drawing and a decided taste for architectural pursuits. While still quite a boy he became useful to his father in making accurate sketches for his numerous publications; but the first employment he undertook, independent of his father, was given to young Pugin by the great jewellers, Messrs. Rundall and Bridge.

He was next employed in designing mediæval furniture for Windsor Castle, and while engaged in this work he

made the acquaintance of an artizan connected with one of the great London theatres. He had been brought up by his mother as a rigid Calvinist, but the wonders to which he was for the first time introduced, behind the scenes at Covent Garden, had a great attraction for a lad of fifteen, and for a time Welby devoted himself to the study of scene-painting and the mechanical contrivances of a theatre. Even in this rather low branch of his profession Pugin achieved great success.

His next whim was for a sea-faring life, and he became for a time the commander of a small schooner, in which he traded to Holland, bringing back with him many curious carvings and antiquities, which formed the nucleus of a fine museum.

Impulsive, reckless, and extravagant, young Pugin appears at this period of his life to have been a source of constant anxiety to his parents. He married, contrary to their wishes, while yet a minor, but lost his wife within a year of their marriage. This sudden blow had the effect of steadying his character, and left him in a state of deep depression. In a comparatively short time, however, we find Pugin remarried and settled at Salisbury, in a house of his own designing. His business as an architect rapidly increased, and at his leisure he visited nearly all the old cathedral towns of England, indulging himself in unlimited indignation at the manner in which the churches have been defaced and destroyed under the pretext of improvement and restoration. His enthusiasm for old Gothic architecture is shown by these extracts from a letter from Wells:—

"If you want to be delighted,—if you want to be astonished, if you want to be half mad, for God's sake come to Wells.

"The most magnificent thing for detail that can be seen; splendid remains, etc. etc.

"No artist's, indeed! The figures of the west-front are magnificent.

"Tell that to Mr. Lucas, and tell him the antique fades away before the ancient. Gothic for ever!"

It was while living at Salisbury that Pugin became a convert to the Roman Catholic faith. That this secession was occasioned by any love for the outward splendour of the Romish ceremonials his old friend and biographer warmly denies; but Pugin himself confesses that—

"The study of ancient ecclesiastical architecture was the primary cause of the change in his sentiments, by inducing him to pursue a course of reading, terminating in his complete conversion."

One of the first effects of his change of creed was the publication by Pugin of a book entitled, *Contrasts, or a Parallel between the Architecture of the 15th and 19th Centuries*, in which, though taking a one-sided and unfair view of all Protestant buildings and churches, he nevertheless succeeded in drawing the attention of the public towards the degraded state of modern architecture. The sensation which this work created tended to make Pugin's name famous, not only as an architect, but as a literary man.

In 1832 he was first introduced to the Earl of Shrewsbury, who became from that time his firm friend and patron. The architect was now engaged on many very important buildings, chiefly Roman Catholic churches and cathedrals both in England and Ireland.

He was, as he expressed it, "worked to death," and had twice as much as he could do, though he worked early and late. He bore most impatiently the interference of the committees appointed to overlook his proceedings, and would at once resign the superintendence of the works he had in hand rather than sacrifice his independence, or defer to the opinion of any man whom he considered a less competent judge than himself.

Even to Lord Shrewsbury he writes about some alterations required at Alton Towers:—

"If I am not enabled to exercise my own judgment and make use of my knowledge and experience I am reduced to the condition of a mere drawing clerk, to work out what I am ordered; and this I cannot bear, and so far from knocking under, I really must decline undertaking the alterations unless your Lordship will consent to its

* *Recollections of A. N. Welby Pugin, and his father Augustus Pugin, &c.* By Benjamin Ferrey, Architect, F.R.S., B.A. With an Appendix, by E. Sheridan Purcell, Esq. London, E. Stanford. 1 vol.

being made worthy of your dignity and residence. . . . I will not sell myself to do a wretched thing!"

Another proof of this proud independence of character occurred some years later, when Pugin was called upon to furnish designs for a great Roman Catholic Cathedral (afterwards St. George's) in London. Some members of the committee, while admiring his beautiful drawings, ventured to inquire the amount at which he estimated the cost of the work and the probable time which it would take to carry it into execution. Instead of returning any answer, the offended architect collected his plans, took up his hat, and walked out of the house.

On being called upon, some days afterwards, for an explanation of his conduct,—

"You asked me," said Pugin, "to furnish designs for a cathedral, chapter-house, cloisters, and conventual buildings upon a large scale. I complied with the request, supposing I was dealing with people who knew what they wanted. The absurd questions put to me, however, showed me my mistake. Who ever heard of a cathedral being completed in the life-time of one man?"

Neither was he more tolerant of being asked for designs likely to be carried out with insufficient funds. To a Roman Catholic prelate, who wished for a very handsome and very economical plan for a church, he sent the following cutting, but characteristic reply:—

"My dear Lord, say thirty shillings more and have a tower and spire at once.—A. W. P.—"

It was indeed by no means Pugin's own custom to deny himself any sum of money for the acquisition of works of art. Out of his yearly income he began, in 1841, to build for himself near Ramsgate a beautiful church and dwelling-house, which he intended to serve as a model of all that was perfect in mediæval architecture. To this work he devoted every spare moment, and upon it (including the cost of the land, &c.) he laid out the sum of 15,000*l.*, though, at his death, it was still left in an incomplete state.

Soon after settling at St. Augustine's, Pugin had the misfortune of losing his second wife, with whom he had lived for ten years very happily. But such was his taste for domestic life that he was not long in making up his mind to enter a third time into "the holy estate of matrimony." Not discouraged by a severe disappointment to the hopes he had entertained of espousing a niece of Lord Shrewsbury's, he formed a most romantic attachment to a young lady, then visiting Ramsgate, which afterwards caused him great trouble and anguish of mind. Indeed, it would almost appear, from his conduct at this time, that the seeds of that terrible malady, which ultimately attacked him, had already begun to work upon his excitable and overtaxed brain.

Having for some months kept up a secret correspondence with the object of his affections, ostensibly with a view of persuading her to join the Roman Catholic Church, he next proposed that she should be privately married to him, "knowing," as he frequently assures her, "that if she expects to obtain the sanction of her family she will be miserably mistaken." To this measure, however, Miss L—— naturally objected, although she had gone the length of "being reconciled to the Church of Rome" unknown to her parents. Pugin also, on reconsidering the matter, gives up the point of a private marriage "feeling;" not that it would be a dishonourable action on his part, but "that it could not be celebrated with the solemnity becoming a person of her position."

The lovers continue, however, to write and to meet constantly and of course clandestinely, and they exchange written promises of marriage of the most solemn and comprehensive nature. Pugin passes the term of probation in putting his house in complete order for the reception of his affianced bride, and designs for her some beautiful specimens of mediæval jewellery, telling her that "though of course he cannot pretend to vie in intrinsic value with thousands of people, yet, that no woman, not excepting the queen, will have better ornaments as regards taste than

she will." In spite of all these arrangements, however, Miss L——, finding that the opposition of her parents to this match would be almost insurmountable, suddenly altered her mind, and despatched a second formal document, in which she declared, in the name of "the holy and ever-blessed Trinity, the blessed Virgin, and all the Saints," that she would from thenceforth hold no communication with Pugin on any pretence whatever.

Poor Pugin was at first stunned by this cruel announcement, and he began a lengthy correspondence with Mr. L——, remonstrating vehemently upon his conduct and that of his daughter, who, by-the-bye, appears to have still continued a little uncertain of her own mind, declaring at one moment that she "would crawl to Ramsgate on her knees," and "die if he did not marry her," and at another, assuring him that "any further intrusion on his part would be exceedingly offensive to her." It was long before the enamoured widower could be prevailed upon to give up his case as hopeless, and it is to be presumed he derived some little consolation to his wounded feelings in printing and circulating among his friends a pamphlet, which he called *A Statement of Facts*, containing his own version of the story, together with his own and the unfortunate Miss L——'s love-letters during the entire period of the courtship. It would appear, from this determination to vindicate his own character at the expense of the woman whom he professed to adore, that Pugin's vanity had suffered in the fray more severely than his heart; and it is also satisfactory to learn that, in the course of the next two years, he was fortunate enough to meet with a lady who not only consented to become his third wife, but who entered enthusiastically into all his pursuits, appreciated his genius, and, when his health gave way, watched over and soothed him with the most tender care.

The manner in which this talented and extraordinary man terminated his brilliant career is melancholy in the extreme. For some years symptoms of mental derangement had shown themselves, in his excessive irritation and nervous depression of spirits. Occasional delusions followed, and, while on a visit to his friend Sir Charles Barry, with whom he had been engaged in making designs for the New Houses of Parliament, Pugin's conduct became so violent as to cause great alarm to that gentleman, who at once called in medical advice; when it was found necessary to place him under restraint. As a curious instance of "the ruling passion, strong in death," the only means of calming the great architect in a fit of frenzy was by a reference to his beloved profession, when, asking for a pencil, he designed on the back of an envelope "an elegant vane, clear and precise," which has since been placed on the corner pinnacle of St. Mary's, Beverley.

Though his mind partially recovered its healthy tone, Pugin's physical strength gave way under the severe and repeated attacks he had undergone, and he sunk from exhaustion, after violent convulsions, on the morning of the 14th of September, 1852, at the early age of forty.

We do not attempt to give any account of Pugin's numerous great public works, nor of his many valuable writings on subjects connected with art. For information on these points we must refer our readers to Mr. Ferrey's very interesting and amusing volume, to which is added an appendix, in which the writings and character of Pugin are considered, in their Catholic aspect, by one of his own faith (Mr. E. S. Purcell). One sentence from Pugin's own pen will suffice to show the "TRUE PRINCIPLE" which actuated his motives and sanctified his labours:—"The greatest privilege possessed by man is to be allowed, while on earth, to contribute to the glory of God."



Ten Years of Imperialism in France.*



THE theoretical student of politics and the practical statesman alike find at once the most absorbing and the most perplexing object of speculation in the present condition and the future prospects of the French empire. It is now ten years since that empire was created, and we may now reasonably anticipate that some measure of the work which it has effected may be taken more or less accurately. Though there may be apparently small warranty for the permanence of the work, and inadequate material for making a complete estimate of its character in its manifold aspects, enough has been performed to justify and even demand a candid investigation of the way in which the French Government fulfils its functions, and of the conditions on which it maintains its existence against the numerous adversaries who detest its principles and aspire to its place. Such an investigation is to be found in the volume before us, which, though modestly pretending to be no more than a record of the impressions of a *Flâneur* or "lounger," is really one of the most excellent books of the year. The *Flâneur* has an intimate knowledge of all the facts calculated to throw light upon the social condition of France; he is an acute observer as well as a patient student of statistics, and he writes in an agreeable style that is not less attractive than the subject itself. Considering the rarity of works of any authority upon so important a topic, our readers will probably be grateful if we select one or two of the *Flâneur's* impressions on points that are most commonly debated, and reproduce them with such considerations as they may suggest. We must premise that the writer takes an almost wholly favourable view of the influences of imperialism, and finds a defence for the imperial policy even where it has been hitherto universally admitted to be weakest. He is so utterly dazzled by the splendid transformation which has been wrought in the city of Paris by the large increase of material prosperity, by the prospects of wide commercial development, and by the suppression of socialism, the evil genius of France, that he overlooks, or at least touches very lightly upon, those other considerations relative to the intellectual and moral condition of the country, and to the pernicious political training that such a system affords to its citizens—considerations, which, in the minds of many sagacious and far-sighted men, far more than outweigh the material advantages which are supposed to compensate for them. But we have no right to demand from a mere *Flâneur*—such as our author for the present avows himself to be—profound speculations upon the inherent perils of even beneficent imperialism, nor by what forms of government the security of property and the lasting welfare of the people are most surely guaranteed. The *Flâneur* only undertakes to communicate his impressions without any analysis or defence of the predilections by which they are tinted.

To begin with what first startles the foreigner in Paris, the marvellous architectural transformation that has been carried out since the commencement of the imperial régime. The city of ten years ago is literally not to be recognized, and the famous Paris of history and fiction will soon have disappeared from off the face of the earth, and given place to the superbest town in the world. Narrow streets, ugly and squalid houses, centres of fermenting political evil, are all vanishing, and splendid thoroughfares and palatial blocks of building spring rapidly up in their stead. The place of the old Paris knoweth it no more; and if Robespierre or Danton were brought to life again they would be unable to recognize the spot where stood the guillotine. Governor de Lannay, standing on the site of his own

bastille, would not know to what city he had been transported; and the First Consul might walk miles without recognizing where he was. This metamorphosis has been ill spoken of, and some persons prefer the picturesque squalor of the old city to the spacious magnificence of the new; but they are not many in number. Others see in it no more than the device of a military usurper, who has made the adornment of Paris the means for a threefold end,—the gratification of the pride or vanity of Parisian citizens; the employment of large bodies of workmen, who, if left without employment, might prove seriously troublesome; and lastly, the military advantages of having wide spaces for the transit of troops and artillery, and the prevention of barricades. But as we are in the company, and under the guidance of a *Flâneur*, we ought to judge the Emperor in an easy and charitable spirit. Even granting that these three considerations formed part of the imperial purpose in making Paris the most magnificent city in Europe, a more extended view of his whole internal policy will convince us that they were of small weight in comparison with others of a loftier and more beneficent character. The adornment of Paris has been but one of many forms adopted for the stimulation of industry. Commercial treaties; subventions for the furtherance of municipal undertakings; loans for the support and encouragement of various public companies; a judicious exhibition of government patronage in relation to the railway system, by which the latter have entirely changed their character as government concerns, and have become private enterprises; the bestowal of government favours of a substantial kind as the sure reward of individual exertion, so that insurance, mining, canal, gas, industrial, and steamboat companies, &c., "have sprung up with a rapidity that is quite astonishing, and have in most cases yielded large profits." It has been said that government aid has only acted as the artificial warmth of a hothouse acts, and that upon the withdrawal of that artificial stimulation all this apparently vigorous enterprise and commercial prosperity would collapse; others reply that the government is furnishing not an artificial climate, but a fertilising manure that will permanently enrich the national soil. The *Flâneur* takes the latter view. He holds that the enormous outlay upon public works has operated most successfully as leaven, and shows that though the leaven thus used up by imperialism is less than the amount laid out in the ten years before that, being 52,000,000*l.* against 68,000,000*l.*, it has still produced a higher rise under the "imperial fertilising system." The *Flâneur* corrects the ordinary notion that large votes for extraordinary works were begun by the present government. "There is not a year," he says, "since 1820, in which extraordinary works do not figure in the budget with sums varying from 25 to 170 millions of francs, which were employed in the construction of canals, roads, and railways, the improvement of rivers and ports, erection of lighthouses and other works. Above all, the last years of the government of Louis Philippe show sums which have never been reached since 1852. This was owing to the first impulse given to railways and to the fortifications of Paris. The Imperial Government therefore, in this respect, only followed its predecessors, with the difference, however, that it had the skill to see their mistakes, and at the same time the power to carry out its own views." It may be worth while to regard the splendour and munificence of the imperial system from a financial and arithmetical point of view. During the years from '51 to '59 (the accounts of the last named are not yet definitely made up) a deficiency of ordinary revenue to expenditure has been created of about 122,080,000*l.* The financial embarrassment of the administration arising from the mischievous imperial privilege of granting supplementary and extraordinary credits has been sufficiently laid before the public. The fact, which in our author's opinion alone justifies the recklessness with which the enormous deficits have been tolerated, is the previous growth of the productive powers of the country. The key to the new policy was the outlay of a portion of the State capital "as an investment for the common good." Its success depended on the maintenance

* *Ten Years of Imperialism in France. Impressions of a "Flâneur."* Wm. Blackwood and Sons.

of a balance between this outlay, this investment of public wealth, and the productive power; if the latter was vigorous, elastic, and increasing, then the former might be advantageously extended. Well, in the year '52 the amount of foreign trade showed an increase of 333,000,000 (frances) over 1851, although in '51 it had reached its maximum. "A few years of deficit seemed of little consequence when the resources increased at such a rate, especially if a large portion of the deficit was owing to outlays on works of public utility, which could be considered as a more or less profitable outlay."

Besides the large increase of the productiveness of the country, another remarkable effect of the stimulation generally given by the Government to enterprise has been the growth of a tendency to financial speculation. Paris now bids fair, we are told, to become the financial as well as the political capital of Europe. England has no longer her monopoly of loans to needy potentates and governments, and many a scheme which has been rejected in London finds supporters among the more daring speculators of the Bourse. Apart from the enormous amount of capital, almost exclusively French, absorbed in various internal undertakings, French capital affords Italian and Spanish loans, supports Italian railways—Lombard, Venetian, South Austrian, Roman, Spanish, and Swiss. And this mania for speculation has had a moral influence far beyond the mere accumulation and employment of capital; it has evoked a hitherto unknown amount of individual energy, and Frenchmen are beginning dimly to comprehend enterprises in which the State does not take the initiative.

But the chief result of all the impulse that has thus been given to commerce and manufacture is that it has solved that problem which seemed destined to overwhelm the French nation in incessant revolution—the great difficulty of the *droit au travail*—the employment of the workman. "Socialism," says our *Flâneur*, "means bread in the eyes of the *ouvrier*; bread he now gets, and oblivious of theory he is content with the fact." Many are found to maintain that this is only a lull in the great French conflict between capital and labour; the *Flâneur* is of opinion that there can be no doubt that the struggle has ceased, and that both sides are anxious to avoid whatever might remind of it. This is probably somewhat too positive. Ten years is not a sufficient time to enable us to say with so much assurance that the demise of a vicious theoretical socialism is completely exorcised from the mind of the French artisan. But whether this be so or not, it is at least clear that the present policy of promoting a spirit of commercial and manufacturing enterprise is the only system out of which we can hope for the political amelioration of the French people. Too long have they been permitted to indulge in the wild theories of doctrinaires and ideologists, believing that happiness can be produced by forms of government unaided by the energy and industry of the individual citizen. They are now beginning to understand these things better; and, as we close the *Flâneur's* admirable volume, we have only one melancholy reflection, and this is, that the work that now looks so satisfactory and so hopeful may collapse in wholesale ruin by the death of one man. Whatever may have been his crimes, and however numerous his demerits, he is the only ruler that France has ever had who comprehends the necessities of his situation.

Arthur Hugh Clough.*



NE of the most significant and the worst conceits of the time is its conceit of poetry. The rhapsodies of scepticism, unbelieving thoughts, blasphemous words,—the thoughts dark and hopeless, the words obscure and twisted into all manner of unnatural and pedantic shapes,—the very metres employed showing a restless craving after something new,

* *Poems*. By Arthur Hugh Clough. Macmillan.

and in their happiest use falling harsh and rugged on the English ear: this is some account of a good deal of what goes by the name of poetry in England now.

There is a great deal of this sort of stuff in the "poems" of Arthur Hugh Clough. Now the intellectual life of many of us has its period of doubt. There comes a time when the world seems a painful enigma—a labyrinth devoid of clue. In the mind of Arthur Clough this state was unhappily permanent: and there seems little reason to suppose that, had he lived longer, he would have escaped from it. Not only was he perplexed by "the riddle of the universe," but by questions of practical life. His motto to the *Amour de Voyage*,—"Il doutait de tout, même de l'amour,"—furnishes the key to his nature. He was a poetical casuist. *Amours de Voyage*, the longest of his recent poems, relates in prolix hexameters how a loiterer in Italy met an English girl there, fancied himself in love with her, but was by no means sure of it; and finally, losing sight of her by the accidents of travel, gave her up with perfect calmness. Thus writes Claude, the hero, to his friend Eustace:—

"After all, do I know that I really cared about her?"

Do nothing more, good Eustace, I pray you. It only will vex me. Take no measures. Indeed, should we meet, I could not be certain; All might be changed, you know. Or perhaps there was nothing to be changed."

Really Miss Mary Trevellyn might think herself fortunate in escaping from so very indecisive a lover. Although *Amours de Voyage* contains some fine passages, the subject is quite unworthy of poetic treatment; and we soon weary of reading the letters of a gentleman whose chief characteristics are unbelief and weakness of will. To quote Mr. Tennyson's noble lines:—

"He seems as one whose footsteps halt,
Toiling in immeasurable sand."

Clough's Pyrrhonism was inalienable from his temperament; and, as his hero doubted of the love between man and woman, so the poet doubted of that greater love on which the universe depends. In most of his minor poems this theme is dominant. Take *The Questioning Spirit*:—

"Dost thou not know that these things only seem?—
I know not, let me dream my dream.
Are dust and ashes fit to make a treasure?—
I know not, let me take my pleasure.
What shall avail the knowledge thou hast sought?—
I know not, let me think my thought.
What is the end of strife?—
I know not, let me live my life.
How many days or e'er thou means't to move?—
I know not, let me love my love.
Were not things old once new?—
I know not, let me do as others do.
And when the rest were over past,
I know not, I will do my duty, said the last."

This final line may be taken as an embodiment of Clough's creed. Having framed and fixed for himself the lowest conception of duty, he never went farther. He never escaped from this "true ignorance." He always "did his duty" well, and seems to have enjoyed life in his way, and made many friends; but he had nothing in the way of belief save that—

"We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."

Some of his lyrics, written at sea, have by their vague suggestiveness an attraction for morbid and unhealthy tempers.

"Where lies the land to which the ship would go?
Far, far ahead, is all her seamen know.
And where the land she travels from? Away,
Far, far behind, is all that they can say."

Here the mystery of ocean is made to indicate that mystery of the universe which always perplexed the poet, haunting his most serene moments. The same feeling

runs through another melancholy and musical lyric, whence we quote one stanza :—

“Come home, come home! And where a home hath he
Whose ship is driving o'er the driving sea?
Through clouds that mutter, and o'er waves that roar,
Say, shall we find, or shall we not, a shore
That is, as is not ship or ocean foam,
Indeed our home?”

Clough's scepticism ran through all his actions, and he may fairly be said to have mistaken his vocation. By nature he was a poet, as *The Bothie of Toper-na-Fuosich* suffices to prove; but he surrendered himself to dull forms of labour, and his last literary work was a careful revision of Dryden's *Plutarch*. Comparing his later poems with the immortal *Bothie*, we find with regret that the life of the man was withering away in him. That poem, simple as Wordsworth, idyllic as Theocritus or Goëthe, full of the joyous spirit of young Oxford men, fresh with the cool breezes of the Highland hills in autumn, is unique in English literature. It is not too much to say that in mere originality it transcends all the writings of Mrs. Browning, and Mr. Tennyson. There is an almost Homeric freedom in it. Its hero, Philip Hewson, is to some extent a reflection of the author. Chartist and poet, with paradoxical notions about the duties of women, and with a tendency to fancy himself in love with every pretty face he encounters, he is only saved from a life of indecision and flirtation by meeting a young lady with somewhat stronger will than his own. Elspie, a Highland lassie, supplies the element wanting in Philip's character. The story is delightfully told. Although we do not agree with Mr. Palgrave that Clough inherited a double portion of Wordsworth's spirit, we admit that he was *almost* as true and hearty a lover of nature as the greater poet.

Clough's humour and subtlety are not inferior to his picturesqueness: the love-scenes between Elspie and Philip are very subtle and beautiful. When she compares herself to one side of the arch of a bridge, building itself up slowly and toilsomely to meet another from the other bank—till “a great invisible hand” drops the keystone, and produces “a queer happy sense of completeness”—the idea is so good that we do not pause to inquire whether Highland lassies often have such notions when they are sweethearting. The same may be said of her comparison of Philip to the sea, and herself to a “quiet stream of inland water,” forced to mingle with the tyrannous tide. If the daughters of Highland blacksmiths talk in this poetico-metaphysical style, wooing must be no joke in the braes of Lochabar.

The fastidiousness which naturally grew upon a man of Clough's peculiar character led him to make many unnecessary alterations in the *Bothie*. He changed its title because “Toper-na-Fuosich” has some ludicrous meaning. He eliminated some of the slang, which gives so truthful an air to the poem. It is a great mistake for a man at forty to think he can improve a poem written before he was thirty. He may make it more elegant and accurate, but every touch will decrease its freshness and vigour. In Clough's case this was particularly true, for the buoyancy of his youth departed too soon, leaving only a sentimental melancholy.

Clough's politics were as indefinite as his theology, but with a touch of republicanism in them. He thought the United States “the happiest country going,” not having lived to see the tragical end of its greatness. Writing the *Amours de Voyage* at Rome, in 1848, he exclaims—

“Honour to speech, and all honour to thee, thou noble Mazzini!”

This is not the place to discuss the amount of honour due to Mazzini; but it may be observed that English

journalists are in much confusion of thought in regard to the relations of Mazzini, Garibaldi, Victor Emmanuel, and Louis Napoleon. At the commencement of any of Garibaldi's wild enterprises our liberal journals gravely remonstrate with him for attempting to unsettle the Italian people. When he succeeds they write him down a hero who always embraces a just cause, and is always triumphant. When he fails they are in much distress to know what is to be done with him.

Clough was very fond of the hexameter, and has written many that are as good as such lines can be in English; but he was too careless in the use of the metre to do much towards its naturalisation. His last poem is entitled *Mari Magno*, and consists of a series of tales supposed to be told on shipboard. They are very much in Crabbe's manner; one of them, *The Clergyman's Tale*, is very beautiful, and shows that the poet's conscience was still tender. Beautiful also is an interlude—*Currente calamo*—whence we quote the opening lines :—

“Quick, painter, quick, the moment seize
Amid the snowy Pyrenees;
More evanescent than the snow,
The pictures come, are seen, and go:
Quick, quick, *currente calamo*.”

“I do not ask the tints that fill
The gate of day 'twixt hill and hill;
I ask not for the hues that fleet
Above the distant peaks; my feet
Are on a poplar-border'd road,
Where, with a saddle and a load,
A donkey, old and ashen-grey,
Reluctant works his weary way.
Before him still, with might and main
Pulling his rope, the rustic rein,
A girl: before both him and me
Frequent she turns, and lets me see
Unconscious, lets me scan and trace
The sunny darkness of her face
And outlines full of Southern grace.”

His biographer tells us that he was “signalized and authenticated as a true Man by the broad seal of Nobleness.” This is, we suppose, what is called “fine writing.” What it may mean we do not profess to know; and, having belief in Revelation, it is, perhaps, not possible that we should. We are afraid that it is the scepticism of Mr. Clough rather than his “poetry” which has been his chief recommendation to some of his principal admirers.

There is an English line worth all the hexameters of Mr. Clough's “poetry,”—

“No very great wit, he believed in a God.”

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We cannot undertake to return communications.



ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Church and State Review" is published on the first of each month, price 1s., or free by post for one year for 14s., payable in advance.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.

A Page	£9 0 0
A Column	4 10 0
Five Lines	0 5 0
Every additional Line	0 1 0

Advertisements must reach the Office not later than the 24th of each Month.

OFFICE: 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

THE Church and State Review, EDITED BY ARCHDEACON DENISON.

Published Monthly, Price 1s., per Post, 1s. 2d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 1.

Review of the Position.
The Question of Retrenchment.
The Church-rate Division.
The American War.
The Clergy Relief Bill. Non-intervention.
The Ebb-tide of Democracy.
"Liberalism" as a Creed. Joseph Wolf.

Rugby and Balliol.
The Position and Prospects of Convocation.
Judgment in Synod.
The Church in the Manufacturing Districts.
The Evidence of Infidelity.
Marriage Licence. The Re-revised Code.
The International Exhibition.

Modern Incredulity.
The Royal Supremacy.
Church and State in America.
Hymnology. Poverty of the Clergy.
Scottish Communion Office. Bigotry.
Convocation in Ireland.

The Life of William Pitt.
Biblical Psychology.
Mendelssohn's Letters.
Lord Auckland's Correspondence.
Mrs. Browning.
Dean Ramsey on the Christian Life.
Dr. Cumming. Miss Sewell on Rome, &c.
Recent Fiction.

CONTENTS OF NO. 2.

Earl Russell. The National Society.
The Whigs and the Church of England.
Mexico. Clergy Relief and Burial Bill.
The Ballot. Mr. Estcourt.
Earl Canning.

Our Want of Clergy. Modern Warfare.
Ultimate Appeal Court.
The Latinian School.
Mission Houses. The Royal Academy.
The Bicentenary. Gipsies.

Innkeepers. The Way of Unity.
Dilapidations. Body Snatchers.
For Better for Worse. Summary of Events.

Carlyle's "Frederick the Great."
Miss Sewell on Rome, &c. Edward Irving.
The Church and the Churches.
Life amongst the Colliers.
Monastic Life. Secularia.
Psychological Inquiries.

CONTENTS OF NO. 3.

Practical Politics.
Judgment in the Court of Arches.
The Session of 1862. Austria and Hungary.
The Oxford Congress. Prussia.
Committee of the National Society.
Editor's Note. Bishop Mackenzie.

Musical Development.
Architectural Development.
Windermere. The Influence of the Clergy.
Meddling. Rural Schools.

Increase of the Episcopate.
Houley Regatta. Bishopric of Honolulu.
Summary.

Church Expansion, &c.
The Present Position of the Liberal Party.
Threefold Nature of Man.
The Astronomy of the Ancients.
Sisters of Mercy. Kingsleyism.
Thirty Years of Musical Recollections.
Schleiermacher.

CONTENTS OF NO. 4.

Political Parties.
Relief of Distress in the North.
Lord Canning's Administration of India.
Mr. Disraeli. The Zambesi Mission.
Canada. India.
The Bishop of Bath and Wells and Mr. Lingen.
The War in America.

The Use and Abuse of Multitudes.
The Way of Unity. (II.) Salads.
Smoking. Brotherhoods.
Pews and Free Sitings.

The Musical Season.
The Lay Element in America.
Suffragan Bishops.
The Northern Convocation.
Summary of Events.

Thackerayism. M. Guizot.
Hawaii.
Twenty Years of Financial Policy.
Creation in Plan and in Progress.
The Astronomy of the Ancients.
Correspondence of Napoleon I.

The CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW may be obtained at all the Railway Book-stalls, and of all Booksellers in Town and Country.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW.
Country Booksellers and Newsagents desirous of having the Contents Bill of the Church and State Review sent them regularly should immediately communicate with the Publishers.

IN PREPARATION. A Reading Cover to contain the current Numbers of the Church and State Review. It will be large enough to hold six copies, and may be obtained to order of any Bookseller or Newsagent.

CLERGY ORPHAN CORPORATION.

Instituted 1749. Incorporated 1809.
Boys' School, St. Thomas's Hill, Canterbury.
Girl's School, St. John's Wood, Marylebone.

Patron—Her Majesty the QUEEN.

The next ELECTION will take place in November.
Candidates should be nominated immediately.

The sons and daughters of deceased Clergymen of the Church of England and Wales are eligible between the ages of 8 and 12.
Forms of application may be had at the office.

Thirty-six children have been added during the last seven years to the number previously in the Schools, and were the subscriptions to continue to increase, a still larger number would be at once admitted. The Committee earnestly solicit aid to enable them to extend the benefits of the Society more widely, as several urgent cases are now before them.

Annual subscription for one vote, 1l. 1s.; life subscription for one vote, 10l. 10s.

J. RUSSELL STOCK, M.A., Secretary.

Bankers—Messrs. Drummond. Office, 63, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W. C.

Exchanges and Advowsons.

WEST MIDLAND AND WEST OF ENGLAND
CLERICAL REGISTRIES (United).

Conducted by a Clergyman,—a late P. C. in the Diocese.

Offices, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link,
Worcestershire.

(Originated April, 1862: 150 Members, Beneficed Clergy and others.)

The above will be found an organized medium by the Clergy in connection with Clerical Business of all kinds, without intervention of agents; and as originated "to serve the Clergy," it is highly approved of by several Dignitaries of the Church, and patronized.

Prospectus on receipt of stamped envelope.

Curates supplied with Curacies, Holy Order Candidates with Titles.

Between 60 and 70 Exchanges offered to Members.

Subscription for the year, 5s. (stamps received) for Curates.

Beneficed Clergy Entrance fee, constituting Membership, reduced from original fee 10s. 6d. to 8s., to meet the wishes of the Clergy; it is therefore respectfully urged that applicants enclose their Subscription, to ensure desired information. Stamps received, 1s. to the 1s.

N.B. Advowsons and Presentations wanted immediately; Presentation to a living of 180l. net, for sale; Curacy can be held, and Interest allowed until vacancy.

Address:—The Reverend the Secretary, as above.

PREPARATION FOR HOLY ORDERS: BISHOPS' EXAMINATIONS.

THE Advertiser, a Clergyman (M.A. Oxon.) of experience and great success in preparing gentlemen for the above, residing at Malvern, Worcestershire, (a delightfully-situated place for Reading, with every facility), has Vacancies; (36 gentlemen have read and passed from the Advertiser). His last pupils were a Durham B.A. and a Student of Christ Church, Oxford, for Priesthood; and he has now two reading for the September and Christmas Ordination, M.A.'s of Oxford—Diaconate and Priesthood.

Prospectus of terms and particulars on application.

Letters to contain real names and addresses. Clerical References required. Lodgings easily procured.

High Clerical References and to Pupils in Orders.

The Advertiser procures for his Pupils fit and proper Titles.

Address:—Reverend P. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

N.B. On Sunday last, the 21st of September, the M.A. alluded to above, as reading for the September Ordination, was ordained Deacon at East Retford, Lincolnshire, by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, having passed the examination.

SUNDAY DUTY taken by a CLERGYMAN

at shortest notice; if only for one Sunday, the usual fee of 2l. 2s. and travelling expenses will be required; beyond one, and every succeeding Sunday, at half the usual fee, and simple travelling expenses. References. Advertiser will be at liberty for Duty after Sunday the 26th of October.

Address:—Reverend S. (care of The Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

Notice.

THE FIRST VOLUME of the LIFE of the BISHOP OF EXETER will be PUBLISHED on the FIRST of NOVEMBER.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street,
Hanover Square.

Exeter Theological College.

Visitor—The Lord Bishop of Exeter.

Council—The Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Principal—The Very Rev. C. J. Ellicott, B.D.

Vice-Principals—The Rev. R. C. Pascoe, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; and the Rev. T. W. Hardy, late Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The College is designed for Graduates of either of the Universities, who are desirous of obtaining instruction in Theology, and of presenting themselves as candidates for Holy Orders in the Diocese of Exeter or elsewhere. Fee 10*l.* each Term.

For further information, respecting time of residence and course of study, apply to the Very Rev. the Dean, Exeter.

The next Term will commence on Tuesday, September 30.

HAILEYBURY COLLEGE.—*Head Master* —The Rev. ARTHUR GRAY BUTLER, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

Terms of Admission.

Pupils not nominated to pay—

Sons of Laymen, 6*5l.* per annum.

Sons of Clergymen, 5*5l.*

Pupils nominated to pay 10*l.* less in each case.

Donors of 100*l.* entitled to have always one pupil in the School.

Donors of 26*l.* 5*s.* entitled to nominate one pupil.

The holidays will be at the same times of the year as at Eton and Harrow. The School will be opened on Thursday the 11th of September next.

All communications are to be addressed to the

Rev. LEWIS DEEDS, Bramfield Rectory, Hertford, } *Hon. Secs.*
E. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Amwell, Ware,

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, RADLEY.

Visitor—The Lord Bishop of Oxford.

TRUSTEES.

His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.

The Hon G. C. Talbot.

Lieut.-Col. Robert Moorsom.

Robert Phillimore, Esq., D.C.L.

The Lord Richard Cavendish.

The Warden of All Souls', Oxford.

J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P.

Warden—Rev. Richard Whitmore Norman, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

Sub-Warden—Rev. William Wood, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

FELLOWS.

W. Haskoll, Captain, R.N., Bursar.

Rev. R. S. Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose Coll., Oxford.

Rev. E. N. Reynolds, A.M., Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.

J. H. Rawdon, M.A., Brasenose Coll., Oxford.

Rev. A. L. Hussey, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.

C. A. Houghton, B.A., Exeter Coll., Oxford.

R. F. Clarke, B.A., Fellow of St. John's Coll., Oxford.

W. W. Jackson, B.A., Balliol Coll., Oxford.

R. Laing, Esq., Wadham Coll., Oxford.

George Wharton, B.A., Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

ASSISTANT TUTORS.

Rev. W. G. Longden, M.A., Fellow of Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

Rev. R. Gibbings, A.M., Trinity Coll., Dublin.

Lecturer in History—Sidney Owen, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.

Director of French—M. Jules Buë.

Drawing (Military Drawing and Water Colours)—W. H. F. Hutchinson, Esq.

Gymnasium—A. Maclaren, Esq.

The College reopened on the 12th Sept., 1862.

The Scholarship of 30*l.*, founded by Sir Walter James, Bart., for annual competition by candidates under eighteen years of age; and the Scholarship of 20*l.*, founded by William Gibbs, Esq., for candidates under fifteen years of age, will be competed for at Michaelmas next.

Parents of Boys not members of the School, but desirous of competing for either Scholarship, may apply to the Junior Bursar, George Price, Esq., St. Peter's College, Radley, Abingdon.

BRIDGWATER GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Head Master—Rev. T. STANTIAL, M.A., Oxon. Author of the Student's Test Book.

The Head Master receives into his house a few young Gentlemen. An effort is made to combine home comforts and influence with the advantages of a high course of education. A Prospectus of Terms, &c., will be forwarded on application.

THE Rev. D. BINNEY prepares Boys for the Winchester College Elections, or other Public Schools. Terms and References on application. Address, The Elms, Shirley W. Southampton.

St. Mary's College, Bampton, Oxon.

UNDER the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Instituted January, 1859, for the purpose of affording a "Public School" Education on Church principles to those of limited means.

The sons of the Clergy, Officers in Her Majesty's Service, and Professional Gentlemen only are received.

The course of Instruction includes Theology, the Classics (with special regard to Prose and Verse Composition), Mathematics, French, German, English, Drawing, Vocal Music, and Drilling.

Fee for Board, Tuition in all Subjects, Washing and Stationery, 9*l.* per quarter, in advance. Printed particulars on receipt of two Stamps.

G. H. DREWE, Warden and Head Master.

S. Andrew's College, Chardstock, Dorset.

A PREPARATORY SCHOOL for the Sons of the Clergy and Laity of small means.

Principal—The Rev. Charles Woodcock, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, and Vicar of the Parish.

Head Master—The Rev. Francis Allen, B.A., Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by a competent staff of Masters.

Terms:—Entrance fee Two Guineas; board, washing, and education, Ten Guineas a quarter, paid in advance. This charge covers all expenses. Full particulars forwarded on application to the Principal.

ST. MARGARET'S COLLEGE, NORTH-END, London, S. W. (near the Kensington Station), for the Education of Young Ladies.

Principal—Rev. ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A.

Lady-Superintendent—Mrs. LENDRUM.

The education and discipline are conducted, under the direction and superintendence of the principal, by talented and accomplished Governesses, English and Foreign, assisted by eminent London Professors.

The buildings consist of a spacious Mansion, with grounds of considerable extent, and large and lofty rooms. Twenty of the senior pupils have separate sleeping apartments.

The next term will commence, after the Midsummer holidays, on Tuesday, the 23rd of September.

N.B.—No day pupils are received.

Prospectuses and particulars sent on application.

PRIVATE TUITION.—A Married Clergyman, late Fellow and Public Tutor, of University Honours, high testimonials, and great experience in education, has ONE VACANCY among Three Pupils, who are prepared for the Universities or Army. Terms moderate.

Address the Rev. M. B., Mr. Andrews', Bookseller, Durham.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced

TUTORS, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M.A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

HAWAIIAN CHURCH MISSION

(Sandwich Islands).

SUBSCRIPTIONS and DONATIONS may be sent to the SPECIAL FUND of this Mission at the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 79, Pall Mall; or to the account of the Treasurers of the Hawaiian Church Fund (J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P., and H. H. Gibbs, Esq.), at Messrs. Barnett, Hoare, and Co's., Bankers, 62, Lombard Street; or to Manley Hopkins, Esq., Hawaiian Consul-General, 4, Royal Exchange Buildings, London.

For information on the subject of the Mission, and for arrangements for Sermons, Meetings, Lectures, &c., address the Rev. Edward L. Cutts, Billericay, Commissary of the Bishop of Honolulu, and Secretary to the Committee of the Hawaiian Church Mission.

WANTED—Board and Residence in a Southern

County. The daughter of a late benefited Clergyman, accustomed to Tuition, wishes to be received into a Clergyman's family circle, where a small quarterly payment and four hours' daily instruction to advanced pupils would ensure her a comfortable home, in a parish where "Daily Prayer" is offered. References to Clergymen and former pupils. Address, Z., 3, Portland Place, East Cliff, Brighton.

GOVERNESSES' BENEVOLENT INSTITUTION.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, with power to hold land by gift, purchase, or bequest.

Under the Patronage of Her Most Gracious Majesty.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge.

Her Royal Highness the Hereditary Grand Duchess of Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

Her Royal Highness the Princess Mary Adelaide.

President.—The Earl of Harrowby.

The objects of this Society are:—

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE to Governesses in distress, afforded privately through the Ladies' Committee.

ANNUITY FUND.—Elective Annuities to aged Governesses secured on invested capital, and thus independent of the prosperity of the Institution.

PROVIDENT FUND.—Provident Annuities purchased by ladies in any way connected with education, upon Government Security, agreeably to the Act of Parliament. This branch includes a Savings' Bank.

A HOME for Governesses during the intervals between their engagements.

A SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION entirely free of expense.

AN ASYLUM for the Aged.

Auditors.—Thomas Hunt, Esq.; Henry Kingscote, Esq.; Capt. the Hon. Francis Maude, R.N.

Treasurer.—Benjamin Bond Cabbell, F.R.S., F.S.A.

Hon. Secretary.—Mrs. D. Laing.

Bankers.—Sir S. Scott and Co., 1, Cavendish Square, W.

CHARLES W. KLUGH, *Secretary.*

No. 32, Sackville Street, W.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE,

gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.

12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE.

An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—ROYAL GERMAN SPA, Brighton.

Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by GEORGE WAUGH & CO., Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

Church-Rates.

THE COMMITTEE of LAYMEN, while they congratulate Churchmen on the renewed rejection of the Abolition Bill, frankly and earnestly call upon all friends of the Constitution to support them with the pecuniary means requisite to ensure similar success for the future. The Committee have hitherto not received a tenth of the annual revenue placed at the disposal of those whose projects they have had to watch and counteract.

It is requested that contributions may be addressed expressly to "The Committee of Laymen," at the banks of Messrs. Hoare, 37, Fleet Street; and Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birchin Lane, London; or to the Honorary Secretary, 16, Manchester Buildings, Westminster, S. W.

JOHN M. KNOTT, *Hon. Sec.*

June 30, 1862.

CHURCH and DECORATIVE EMBROIDERY. FOR EVERY PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH.

Executed from the best and most practicable Designs and Examples of ANCIENT NEEDLEWORK. Ante-pendia, Chancel-carpet, Sermon-cases, Book-markers, &c. &c., prepared with every facility for Ladies own working.

By R. HELBRONNER, 265, Regent Street, (near the Circus, Oxford Street).

ROBERT COCKS and Co.'s NEW PIANO-FORTES.

Warranted. Price 25*l.*, 35*l.*, and 42*l.* each.

ORGAN MUSIC. The Second Volume of W. T. BEST's Collection of Organ Compositions, Ancient and Modern.

12 Nos., 3*s.* each; or, Complete, cloth bds. 30*s.* Lists of Mr. BEST'S Works may be had, *gratis* and *post free*.

HALF HOURS at the ORGAN. By JOHN BISHOP.

12 books, 3*s.* each; or in one volume, bound in cloth, 30*s.*

W. T. BEST'S 130 CHORUSES of HANDEL for Pedal Organs 3*l.* 3*s.*

Single Choruses at various prices. Contents *gratis* and *post free*.

London: ROBERT COCKS and Co., New Burlington Street, and of all Music-sellers.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS,

with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3*l.* The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c.

Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, *post free*.

Also, ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, *post free*.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W.C.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY.

Capital 100,000*l.* Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

Now ready, price 1*s.* 6*d.* each, *post free*.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC GALLERY.

The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.
BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Mersey and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickensteth, Mackenzie, Denison.
DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellicott, Jacobson, Sewell, Gubric, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolf.

REVERENDS C. Kingsley, Vaughan, Bryan King, Hugh McNeile, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upson Richards, W. Gresley, J. Mackonochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. P. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Gey, J. M. Bellow, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Ware-

houses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed

that RICHARD LOADER and Co. have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers *gratis* and *postage free*. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E.C.

84,000*l.* in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at 3½ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, Mr. STEPHENS, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

Urgent Appeal.

ST. JUDE'S, GRAY'S INN ROAD.

Population 9,000 Souls.

THE SCHOOL CHURCH of this District, in which a large congregation, chiefly poor, now assembles, must be given up to the Metropolitan Railway Company at Lady Day, 1863.

A new Church must be erected, or this CONGREGATION will be DISPERSED, and the PAROCHIAL MACHINERY in connection with it BE BROKEN UP.

The site is purchased, and arrangements made to commence building at once, if the further sum of 2,500*l.* can be obtained.

A Friend, in consideration of the urgency of the case, has offered 500*l.* on condition that 500*l.* more be raised to meet it.

Full particulars may be obtained from the Rev. Canon Champneys, 31, Gordon Square, W. C.; Rev. John Andrews, 38, Argyle Square, W. C.; Henry Hoare, Esq., Fleet Street; and John Labouchere, Esq., Birchin Lane. Bankers, Messrs. Stevenson and Salt, 20, Lombard Street.

Vintage Wine Company.

IMPORTERS OF SPANISH WINES.

XERES COMIDA SHERRY,

Soft, Fine Body, Age, and Flavour.

"A marvel of purity and cheapness."—*See Press.*

Golden, 18*s.*; Pale, 20*s.* per dozen.

Samples for 1*s.* 6*d.*

Hampers of Two Dozen carriage paid to any Railway Station.

VINTAGE WINE COMPANY,

14, Bloomsbury Street, London.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY

WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10*s.*; single sample, 2*s.*

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

GARDNER'S 2*l.* 2*s.* DINNER SERVICES

complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3*s.* 6*d.* per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7*s.* 6*d.* per pair. H. and J. GARDNER (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

KNICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15*s.* 6*d.*

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25*s.*

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,

150, Regent Street.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW

SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.

H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

*Now ready, price 14*s.**

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.

BY SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, BART., M.P.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,

66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Bicentenary Volume.

THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE have just published a volume which contains all the public documents of importance, from "The Declaration of Breda" to "The Act of Toleration," that relate to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. The documents are collected from the most authentic sources; and being published without note or comment of any kind, they are left to tell their own unbiassed tale. This volume, 516 pp., demy 8vo., printed in a clear handsome type, may be had bound in embossed gilt-lettered cloth, price 4*s.* 6*d.*, or stitched in paper covers, price 4*s.*

London: W. KENT AND CO., 23, Paternoster Row; and at the Office of the Committee, 10, Broad Street Buildings, E. C.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS at BULL'S LIBRARY.—Surplus Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices.* Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

2*d.* IN THE 1*s.* DISCOUNT ALLOWED on BOOKS and MAGAZINES purchased at 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

PARCELS OF 5*l.* VALUE (at this rate) sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

CLERGYMEN, BOOK SOCIETIES, and LARGE BUYERS, supplied on more advantageous terms.

MAGAZINES supplied regularly on the 1st of the Month.

ANY BOOK sent Carriage Free on receipt of the Published Price.

A CATALOGUE of Books for Lending Libraries, sent for one Stamp.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S SERMON and MANUSCRIPT PAPERS, Ruled and Unruled, are sold in packets of 5 quires, at 1*s.* 3*d.*, 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, and 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

SAMPLES sent POST FREE on application.

PAPER RULED to ANY PATTERN on reasonable terms.

SERMON CASES with Two Pockets, 3*s.* each, post free.

PARCELS OF 20*s.* WORTH sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices, for Cash only:—

The Complete Suit	52 <i>s.</i>	63 <i>s.</i>	and	85 <i>s.</i>
Morning Coats	25 <i>s.</i>	30 <i>s.</i>	and	45 <i>s.</i>
Trousers	16 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	21 <i>s.</i>	and	26 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>
Waistcoats	10 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>	12 <i>s.</i>	and	13 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i>
Frock and Overcoats	30 <i>s.</i>	36 <i>s.</i>	and	55 <i>s.</i>

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors, next door to Somerset House, Strand.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

* A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

The Conservative Land Society.

THE ELEVENTH YEAR. Trustees—**VISCOUNT RANELAGH**, and **J. C. COBBOLD, Esq., M.P.** This Society has now entered on its Eleventh Year, having been established on September 7th, 1852. Prospectuses, explanatory of the Share, Deposit, Land and Building Departments, will be sent, free of charge, to any part of the world. No Partnership Liability, and the taking of land entirely optional. Present rate of interest, payable in half-yearly warrants, 5 per cent. per annum on Shares (with participation in any profits above that allowance), and 4 per cent. per annum on Deposit Accounts, the Investors not becoming Members of the Society.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.
Offices, 33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

Just published, Post free for 7 Stamps.

"WHAT IS PUSEYITE?"

By a **LITTLE SPRITE.**

JOHN HODGES, Frome Selwood.

Now ready, 670 pages, 8vo. price 6s.

ENGLISH PURITANISM: being DOCUMENTS relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. With an Historical Introduction, by **PETER BAYNE, Esq., A.M.**

London: **W. KENT AND CO.**, Paternoster Row. Sold also at the Offices of the Central United Bartholomew Committee, 10, Broad Street Buildings, E. C.

Just published, post 8vo. 1s.

INSPIRATION and INTERPRETATION: being an Enquiry into the Relation between the Literal and Spiritual Senses of the Word of God, as founded upon the Science of Correspondence. No. IV. By the **Rev. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A.**, formerly of Exeter College, Oxford.

"Sterling grew to regard an intelligent theory of Inspiration, and the relation between the Bible and the faith which it conveys, as the most pressing want of our Church. That it is a most pressing one is indeed certain; and such it has been acknowledged to be by those who meditate on Theology."—*Archdeacon Hare's Life of Sterling*, p. 130.

Oxford: **HENRY HAMMANS**, High Street.

London: **WHITTAKER AND CO.**

The Literary Budget.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF LITERATURE,

THE DRAMA, SCIENCE,
AND ART.

Published every Saturday.

PRICE 3d.

NO. 12, FOR SEPTEMBER 20TH,
CONTAINS:—

Modern Fine Style, Spasmodic and Sensational.
Sermons. Historical Scepticism.
Satanalogia; or, some Remarks on Milton's
Fallen Seraphs.

Life and Letters of Washington Irving.
Burke and the Australian Exploring Expedition.
Humorous Verse. The Maroon.

Reviewers' Justice.
French and Italian Correspondence.

English Opera Companies.
The Relief of Lucknow at Drury Lane.

Transitions in Style in the Schools of English
Painting.
Our Artistic Tourists.

The National Debt.
Shakespeare in France.
Errors of the Press.

Fant Literature.
Gossip, &c. &c.

NO. 13, FOR SEPTEMBER 27TH,
CONTAINS:—

English Romance and French Criticism.
Pedestrian Guide Books.
Tendencies of Modern Thought.
Diplomatic Literature.

The South Vindicated.
Correspondence of Napoleon I.
An Old Man's Thoughts.
Action of Imponderable Agents.
Undine Medicatrix.

Our Public Monuments. Artistic Tourists.
The Anastatic Drawing Society.

Autographs.
Munificent Patronage of Art.
Ye Banks and Braes. Gossip, &c. &c.

OFFICE: 7, Burleigh Street, Strand, London; and may be had
of all Booksellers and Newsmen throughout the Country.

DEAN ALFORD'S NEW VOLUME OF SERMONS.

Now ready, in crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SERMONS on CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, preached in Canterbury Cathedral on the Afternoons of the Sundays in the Year 1861-2. By **HENRY ALFORD, D.D.**, Dean of Canterbury.

London: **RIVINGTONS**, Waterloo Place.

New Works by EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.

Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s., by post 1s. 2d.

THE PRESERVATION OF GENERAL HEALTH.

With some Remarks upon Healthy Skin, and Subjects of Medical interest to the Public generally, including Notes upon Homœopathy, Nursing, or Attendance upon the Sick, and the Medical Art.

BY **EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.**

Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, Assistant Physician to the Royal General Dispensary, Member of the Hunterian Society, &c. &c.

London: **HOULSTON AND WRIGHT**, Paternoster Row.

Also by the same Author, fcap. 8vo. 1s., by post, 1s. 2d.

SKIN DISEASES,

AND THEIR CURE BY DIATHETICAL TREATMENT.

ILLUSTRATED BY CASES.

London: **HENRY RENSCHAW**, 356, Strand.

Seventh Edition, fcap. 2s. 6d. sewed; or 3s. cloth.

THE WATER-CURE in CHRONIC DISEASE: an Exposition of the Causes, Progress, and Termination of various Chronic Diseases of the Digestive Organs, Lungs, Nerves, Limbs, and Skin; and of their Treatment by Water and other Hygienic Means. By **JAMES MANBY GULLY, M.D., L.R.C.S., and F.R.P.S. Edinburgh, and F.R.M.C.S. London, &c.**

"Dr. Gully has published a large and elaborate work on the Water Cure, which is, we think, the best treatise on the subject that has yet appeared."—*Westminster Review*.

"Dr. Gully's book is evidently written by a well-educated medical man. This work is by far the most scientific that we have seen on hydropathy."—*Athenæum*.

"Of all the expositions which have been published respecting the Water Cure, this is the most tangible and complete."—*Literary Gazette*.

London: **SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO.**,
Stationers' Hall Court.

Old Bottled Port 20,000 Dozen.

Laid down during the last 40 Years.

NOW BOTTLING, 100 PIPES—1858 VINTAGE.

Pasto Sherries, Moselles, Hocks, and Champagnes. 1st Growth Claret, Burgundies, and very old Virgin Marsalas, &c.

Price List of all Wines Post Free.

GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, London, E. C.

"St. Martin" Malaga, very choice, for Sacramental use, 50s. Best Red Tent, 42s. net. On receipt of P. O. Order.

Teeth.

OSTEO-EIDON.—What is it? See Patent, March 1, 1862, No. 560. **GABRIEL'S** Self-adhesive Patent Indestructible MINERAL TEETH and FLEXIBLE GUMS, without palate, springs, or wires, and without operation. One set lasts a lifetime, and warranted for mastication or articulation, even when all others fail. Purest materials only, at half the usual cost.

Messrs. **GABRIEL**, the old-established Dentists, 27, Harley Street, Cavendish Square, and 34, Ludgate Hill, London; 134, Duke Street, Liverpool; and 65, New Street, Birmingham. International Exhibition, Class 17.

One visit only requisite.

Gabriel's "Practical Treatise on the Teeth," gratis. Complete sets from four to seven guineas, and ten to fifteen guineas. Consultations free.

MESSRS. SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO'S.

Literary Announcements.

VALIKANOW'S TRAVELS in CENTRAL ASIA. Translated from the Russian, by Authority. Illustrated. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The ASIAN EXPEDITION. Travels in Ladak, Tartary, and Kashmir. With numerous chromo-lithographic illustrations from sketches taken on the spot. By Lieut.-Colonel TORRENS, 23rd Royal Welsh Fusiliers. 8vo. 28s. [Ready.]

The LIFE and TIMES of SIR JAMES GRAHAM. By W. TORRENS M'CULLAGH. 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The AUSTRALIAN EXPEDITION; STUART'S Explorations into Southern Australia. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The HISTORY of the BRITISH NAVY, from the Earliest Era to the Present Time. By C. D. YONGE, ESQ., Author of "The Life of the Duke of Wellington." 2 vols. royal 8vo. with Plates, &c. [In Preparation.]

NIPHON and PECHILI; Impressions of Japan and the North of China. By EDWARD BARRINGTON DE FONBLANQUE, Assistant Commissary-General. 8vo. Illustrated. [Nearly Ready.]

On the AIMS and EXTENT of a NATIONAL MUSEUM of NATURAL HISTORY. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. 8vo. 6s. [Ready.]

The FINANCIAL POLICY of ENGLAND for TWENTY YEARS, from 1842 to 1862. By Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, Bart., M.P. 8vo. 14s. [Ready.]

MEMOIRS of the SPEAKERS of the HOUSE of COMMONS. By WILLIAM NATHANIEL MASSEY, ESQ., M.P., Author of "The History of England during the Reign of George III.," and Chairman of Ways and Means. 8vo. [Ready.]

TALES of the OUT-SPAN; or, Adventures in the Wilds of Southern Africa. By CAPTAIN DRAYSON. Illustrated. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]

MADAME DE STAEL and the GRAND DUCHESS LOUISE. A selection from the hitherto unpublished correspondence of Madame de Staël, and the Grand Duchesse Louise and Saxe Weimer, from 1800 to 1817; together with a letter to Bonaparte, First Consul; and another to Napoleon, Emperor. In 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

The MARQUIS of DALHOUSIE'S ADMINISTRATION of BRITISH INDIA. By EDWIN ARNOLD, M.A., of University College, Oxford. 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]

LIFE on the NIGER; or the Journal of an African Trader. [In Preparation.]

The LIFE, TIMES, and WRITINGS of the BISHOP of EXETER. By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, of S. Mary Steps, Exeter, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." [Vol. I. Nearly Ready.]

The POLITICAL LIFE of the EARL of DERBY. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]

Some ACCOUNT of BRITISH COLUMBIA. By the Venerable the ARCHDEACON of BRITISH COLUMBIA. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The HISTORY of the CATHOLIC CHURCH from the Day of Pentecost to the Present Time. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, of Sackville College. 4 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The PRESENT POSITION of the "LIBERAL" PARTY. By the Author of "Miriam May" and "Crispin Ken." 8vo. 15s. [Ready.]

The LIFE and TIMES of LORD BOLINGBROKE. [In Preparation.]

The INFLUENCE of the CHURCH on the CIVILIZATION of the WORLD. A Contribution to the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM LEE, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. In 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

FAITH and PEACE. Being Answers to "Essays and Reviews" by Several Writers. With a Preface by the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]

The CRUISE of the SAINT GEORGE on the WEST INDIAN and NORTH AMERICAN STATION. 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

The RELATION of CHURCH and STATE, and the Nature and Effect of an Established Religion. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. [In Preparation.]

The LATITUDINARIANS. A Chapter of Church History from the Accession of Archbishop Tillotson, in 1691, to the Death of Archbishop Blackburne, in 1787. By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland. [In Preparation.]

CALABRIA and the LIPARIAN ISLANDS in 1860. 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

The LIFE of the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. [In Preparation.]

The CHURCHES of the EAST. By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. [In Preparation.]

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS of the SUCCESSORS of SAINT PATRICK, and the BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS of ARMAGH. By JAMES HEN-THORN TODD, D.D., F.S.A.; President of the Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. [In the Press.]

ECCLESIA RESTITUTA. By F. C. MASSINGBERD, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Ormsby. [In Preparation.]

ECCLESIA VINDICATA: a Treatise on Appeals in Matters Spiritual. With Suggestions for amending the Course of Proceeding in Appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. Dedicated (by permission) to the Earl of Derby, K.G. By JAMES WAYLAND JOYCE, M.A. 12mo. cloth, 5s. 6d. [Ready.]

SERMONS by the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's Church, Wakefield, with a Memoir of his Life. Edited by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [In Preparation.]

The HISTORY of the CONSERVATIVE PARTY from the Defection of Sir Robert Peel to the Present Time. [In Preparation.]

BIBLIOLATRY; an Essay. By the Rev. JAMES HUGHES, M.A. 12mo. cloth, 2s. 6d. [Ready.]

NORTHERN EUROPE. Denmark, Sweden, Russia, in 1861. By Captain N. B. LAURIE. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]

RICHARD COBDEN. A Biography.

The HISTORY of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, Player and Poet, with New Facts and Traditions. By S. W. FULLON, Author of "The Great Highway," &c. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]

The HISTORY of GIBRALTAR, and of its Political Relation to Events in Europe, from the Commencement of the Moorish Dynasty in Spain to the Last Morocco War. With Original Papers and Correspondence, and an Account of the Fourteen Sieges the Rock has sustained since it became a Fortress. By Captain SAYER, Civil Magistrate at Gibraltar. Illustrated. 8vo. 18s. [Ready.]

The HELIOTROPIUM; or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine. Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Drexelius, by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [Nearly Ready.]

The SHANNON'S BRIGADE in INDIA. By EDMUND HOPE VERNER, R.N. With Illustrations. 8vo. 7s. 6d. [Ready.]

The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. PERRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. 21s. [New Ready.]

A MIRROR in AMERICA; or, Political Analogies Across the Atlantic. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. 8vo. 3s. 6d. [Ready.]

ESSAYS on LITURGOLOGY and CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., of Sackville College. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]

CRISPIN KEN. By the Author of "Miriam May." Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Bart., M.P. 2 vols. post 8vo.; Cheap Edition, 7s., with "A Word to Churchmen." [Recently Published.]

SPURS and SKIRTS. By Allet. 1 vol. 10s. 6d.

The WEIRD of the WENTWORTHS; a Tale of George IV's Time. By JOHANNES SCOTUS. 2 vols. 21s.

RECOLLECTIONS of a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN. 8vo. cloth, 5s.

The VALLEY of the MAUDE. By the Author of "Atheline; or, the Castle by the Sea." 3 vols. 31s. 6d. [Ready.]

The AMERICAN CHURCH and the AMERICAN UNION. By HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

RECOLLECTIONS of LABRADOR LIFE. 7s. 6d.

WHEAT and TARES. Originally published in "Fraser's Magazine." Post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BETTER DAYS. Edited by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." 2 vols. 21s.

The DREAM of a LIFE. By Lady SCOTT. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.

The CURATE of CRANSTON. By CUTHBERT BEDE, Author of "Mr. Verdant Green," &c. 10s. 6d.

A WOMAN'S LIFE. A Novel. 2 vols. 21s.

LIFE AMONGST the COLLIERIES. 5s.

LEADERS of PUBLIC OPINION in IRELAND. Fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

The LITERARY WOMEN of ENGLAND. 8vo. 18s.

CHURCH RATE a NATIONAL TRUST. By the Venerable Archdeacon DENISON. 8vo. 5s. New Edition.

The LIFE of Dr. WOLFF. New and cheap edition, revised and enlarged, with full-length portraits. 8vo. 12s.

The CIRCUMNAVIGATION of the GLOBE by the Austrian Frigate Novara. English Edition. Containing an unpublished letter from Baron Humboldt. With numerous wood engravings. Dedicated, by special permission, to Sir Roderick Murchison. 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. now ready, 30s.

CONSTANCE MORDAUNT; or, Life in the Western Archipelago. 2 vols. 21s.

The STAR of LOVELL: a Tale of the Poor Clergy. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.

The FIELD of LIFE: or, Sowing and Reaping. Second Edition. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.

CLINTON MAYNARD; A Tale of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. 10s. 6d.

Why PAUL FERROLL KILLED his WIFE. New and Cheap Edition. 5s.

The LIFE and CORRESPONDENCE of LORD BACON: a Reply to Mr. Hepworth Dixon's "Personal History of Bacon." 8vo. 14s.

REMARKS on ESSAYS and REVIEWS. By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Madras. 1s. 6d.

The CHARGE of the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON, 1862. 4d.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO. 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

Church and State Review.

No. 6, Vol. I.

November 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

Greek and Latin.

IN "ignorant impatience" of Greek and Latin is one of many present tokens, not of the "manhood of the world," as supposed to exist at Rugby School and Balliol College, but of the childhood of the world, or its decrepitude; of the infantine or puerile character (guilelessness apart) of its knowledge and its "wisdom."

There is nothing about which a larger amount of shallow and conceited nonsense is more glibly talked by men and women, who ought to know better, than about Greek and Latin.

And yet there is some considerable excuse for this silly talking. It is in this case as in others—good things suffer not so much from the depreciation of ignorance or the assaults of ill-will, as from the misuse and mismanagement and unfaithfulness of friends.

Claiming, then, all and everything that is claimed by any man for Greek and Latin as the staple material of a liberal education; regarding as idle all that is said about the desirableness of teaching boys at school a variety of things, as though this were the use and the purpose of school-life; knowing well that there is nothing which can replace, or even come into competition with, Greek and Latin for the purposes of education, that is, of training and sharpening the mind; maintaining that education and instruction are not convertible terms; for a boy may be greatly instructed but not educated at all, while a boy educated is put into the best position to be instructed with advantage and to instruct himself; claiming and knowing and affirming and maintaining all this, we allow freely and fully that when the years expended, in the case of a large and important class of English youth, upon the supposed acquirement of some knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages, of some perception of their beauty, and some grasping of their power, together with the comparative paucity and poverty of the results, *and the price paid*, are taken into account, there is some considerable excuse not only for ignorant, but also for deliberate, impatience in this matter.

The man who suggests anything which shall be found upon trial to correct and better adjust these proportions, and shall thus, in an utilitarian age, help to save "Greek and Latin," by showing that

it is possible, and not difficult, to teach them better and more generally in fewer years, will do no little service to Church and State. If something be not done, and that speedily done, to improve and realize the teaching of Greek and Latin in our schools, the time is not, we fear, far off when defenders will be fewer in number and fainter in heart, and when an ignorant and a deliberate impatience will carry all before them.

Let us try our hand.

The ordinary appliances of an English private or public school, and, we may add, of an English University, for introducing a young gentleman to some speaking acquaintance with Greek and Latin books have been tried so long and, with rare exceptions, have so signally failed, that it is not a little remarkable that no attempts, so to speak, should have been made to devise other appliances which might have some better success. But remarkable as it is, it is about the true account of the case. Generation after generation of boys succeed in the same school. The *quantum* of Greek and Latin that is carried away is not appreciable. The *quale*—we will not say what the *quale* is. And yet because, after all, English schools are, upon the whole, very fine things, teachers magnify, and parents acquiesce in, and pay the bills of, the existing *status*.

But it is time to look about us a little. We are getting very thick upon the ground; and it is becoming a harder matter every day for young gentlemen to make ends meet nicely. The race of life is very fast; and if a boy is to do well he must start fair. Now no boy can well afford to part with Greek and Latin. What we mean is that every boy in a first class school would be much better with it. But what he has of it he wants good of the kind and as plenty as may be; and what he does not want is to spend more time upon learning it thoroughly than is necessary.

These are the requirements. How do our schools set about meeting and providing for them? Really it is a wonderful case. Conceive a boy being supposed to learn to express himself in Latin by writing Latin themes. Is there anything in nature or art so grotesque as a Latin theme? It is not a wise or hopeful proceeding to tell a learner to do two incompatible things at once. But this is just what is done every time that a boy is set to write a Latin theme. He is told, that is, to think out a subject, and to express his thoughts elegantly; and to do both in a language with which he is not familiar.

G

Now we are all for difficult things in teaching, but this is not a difficulty, it is a hindrance. It is to spur and to curb a boy at the same moment. If you want a boy to think, untie his mind and let him think in his own language. If you want him to express himself with terseness and elegance in another language, don't ask him to think at the same time. We speak from personal experience. We doubt if there is anything in the world more futile and ridiculous than the three or four hundred things called "themes" which find their way every week at Eton from the boys' bureaux to the master's desk. It would be curious to reckon up in any given week how many of them begin with *omnes homines*, and, after a convulsive and despairing struggle through fourteen lines, end with *faciunt*.

And then verses—another cherished institution. We have great faith in verse-making, Greek and Latin, and especially Latin; but we have no faith in it as practised in our schools. What can be more silly than to start, first, with the assumption that every boy in the school is an imaginative boy; and, secondly, that he is competent to exercise his imaginative power and to express it gracefully, according to the laws of metre, in languages to know something of which is his daily struggle? Why, it is just as in the case of the "theme." You are asking the boy to do two things at the same time which should not be attempted at the same time, and cannot be done well, unless in exceptional cases, at the same time. Asking him for both, you are hindering both. If the boy has any imagination, why cramp it by the necessity of expressing it in a difficult shape? If he has not got any imagination, why hinder him in polishing his language by making him hunt for thoughts? The rule, applicable to ninety-nine boys out of a hundred, for writing Greek and Latin verses, is translation from English poetry; not what is called, by school courtesy, original composition.

Then learning by heart—an excellent thing. But why is it to be all *verse* that is learnt? Learning *prose* by heart is a far more effectual process for mastering a language, and supplies the memory with much more of idiomatic expression. It may be doubted, too, whether it be not equally improving to the taste. It is also more difficult—a point always to be kept in sight.

But the greater part of time in school is spent in construing Greek and Latin books into English. Now we hold that of all ways this is the least calculated to teach a boy Greek and Latin, at once the most irksome and the least profitable. And the experience of public school-boys may be appealed to, whether it be not true that of all the time that they are *at* school the time that is passed *in* school, when some few of a class are construing and the rest doing nothing but making as much noise as they can without getting "put in the bill," is not the time most thrown away?

These processes, with some writing of "exercises," make up the appliances of our schools for teaching Greek and Latin from six to eighteen.

The result is bad. It is wonderful that anybody should ever have imagined it could be anything else. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*. Hence the ignorant impatience of Greek and Latin so widely prevailing;

hence also, where it exists, the deliberate impatience. Now what we say is that it is the system of teaching, or rather of pretending to teach, which has to bear the blame for having provoked the impatience not only of those who do not know what the value and use of Greek and Latin is, but of many who do know it. There will always be plenty of people in the world who want to get quickly at results by a coarse and vulgar process, and who think that the point to be gained by sending a boy to school is to turn him out ready-made for this or that walk in life. These people, men and women, will always declaim against Greek and Latin. But there is neither wisdom nor kindness in swelling their ranks with sensible people, who do know something about education—what it is and how it should be done—by so futile an application of their best machine that they give up the matter in despair.

The real way of teaching and learning a language forms, so to speak, no part of our school method. Perhaps, there may be, here and there, exceptions with which we are not acquainted. True, it is not an easy way for the teacher. True, it requires an accurate and thorough and finished scholar. But then, when people pay the prices they do pay for their boys at school, they have a right to demand that they shall be supplied with the best teaching power. A school of eight hundred boys requires not less than thirty-two teachers to work it, as it should be worked, in Greek and Latin; and at the present rate of charges this number would be provided for sufficiently and handsomely.

The way we mean is the way of *oral translation*. That is, rendering *viva voce*, without assistance, a good English prose author into Greek or Latin.

We would have at least two hours in the day allotted to this process. The teacher of the class to tell each boy from time to time to bring into school the same volume of some English prose writer: in school to begin with the head boy, and call upon him to render a sentence into Greek or Latin, as the case may be. If he cannot, or makes any gross blunder, to call upon the next, and see if *he can take his place*. If there is no actual failure, or gross blunder, to correct, when necessary, in point of idiom; to improve and polish in point of elegance; to ascertain accuracy in point of grammar. Many boys might be called upon in an hour. When the class next meets begin where you left off in it, always varying the passage, that there may be no power of previous preparation upon it.

People who have never practised this way of teaching Greek and Latin will be much surprised to find how speedily it tells upon a boy who has, when he begins, very little knowledge indeed of either. It is very interesting; very nerving to emulation. The steps made in it are not easily forgotten; and it has a power of correcting and improving the taste, and of imparting an accurate and familiar acquaintance with the language, which does not belong to construing and parsing. We doubt whether in a school where it is practised, boys would be found to say that the time passed *in* school is the time most thrown away.

We would not be understood as wishing to discard construing and parsing; much less written translation, properly handled; for, next to oral

translation, this is the chief instrument in acquiring a language. Nor, again, would we debar an imaginative boy, if he pleases, from original composition, or a thoughtful boy from essay writing, in Greek and Latin. But the rule of every school should be *translation—translation—translation*, in verse and in prose; and especially, and more than all other, *oral translation*.

The War in America.

IN many respects the general character of this prodigious war is unchanged. We still hear of gigantic armies, of battles on the largest scale, in which the Federals at first claim the victory, but in which it frequently turns out afterwards that as much is to be said for a similar claim on the part of the Confederates. Money for the prosecution of it is still voted and expended in the same reckless manner as at first; and neither statesmen, nor mob-orators, nor preachers, are deterred by the falsification of the predictions on which they have hitherto ventured, from reasserting them in nearly the same terms, and still proclaiming the certainty of an early termination of a war which they persist in calling a rebellion. If in other respects it is becoming more discouraging for the Federals, and more fearful and unnatural in the temper shown by both parties, still that alteration is only what was anticipated with confidence on this side of the Atlantic, and has its foundation so completely in the very nature of the whole contest that it could not possibly have failed to take place. That after a time the levies would come in more slowly, so that one single province should fall short of furnishing its proper complement by upwards of 30,000 men, as the last accounts state to be the case in New York itself; that gold should rise to 24 premium; that the advance of the Confederate armies within sight of the capital should engender qualms among the faint-hearted, and tempt some of the journalists to feel the popular pulse by suggestions of peace, though as yet only of peace on conditions establishing the humiliation of the South: that these aspirations of pacific calculating timidity should be beaten down by more furious denunciations than ever from the war party, and that the increased ferocity of the North should kindle fiercer exasperations in the South, were all occurrences which it required no particular sagacity to prognosticate. But while the struggle was thus proceeding, in what may be almost called its natural course, President Lincoln has suddenly bethought himself of varying its features by one measure which (though something of the kind had been threatened by a section of his partisans), in its details, as he has launched it, appears to have stricken all parties in America as well as in Europe with astonishment. At the end of September he issued a proclamation, announcing that in every State which, at the beginning of the ensuing year, should still "be in rebellion against the United States, all persons held as slaves shall be thenceforward and forever free." That his government, his naval and military force, "will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to

repress such persons in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom." The concluding sentences of the proclamation promise that, on the first of January next, another such document shall designate the States falling, by their protracted contumacy, under the edge of this edict; and they also point out to those apparently likely to be embraced by it the steps which they are required to take if they would escape from its tremendous consequences.

It is not too much to say that this proclamation was received with the unanimous disapprobation of the whole world. The very vessel that brought it to Europe brought at the same time the intelligence that, even in the States recognizing the President's authority, it was "considered a blunder by all but extreme abolitionists." And that feeling would seem to have gained ground. That the edict is not popular with the army may be inferred from the prohibition to discuss it which General McClellan has issued to his troops: while reports, apparently trustworthy, represent Mr. Lincoln himself as entertaining, and openly expressing his doubts as to its propriety. In the "new nation," to use Mr. Gladstone's phrase, against which it is directed, it has produced, as was natural, extreme exasperation, and threats of the severest retaliation. President Davis and his government denounce it as a fanatical and wicked attempt to kindle a servile war in their territories, as a direct encouragement to their slaves to rise and murder their masters, and announce a resolution to put all their prisoners to hard labour till it is repealed, and to slaughter without mercy any one who shall attempt to give effect to it by action. In Europe it has not met with more favour; and nowhere has it been more unsparingly and unanimously denounced than in England, where, above all other countries on the face of the earth, an honest and sincere attempt to mitigate, and, much more, to extinguish slavery, would have been hailed with a cordial enthusiasm which would have gone far to conciliate the whole nation, and to gain it over to the side of him who made it, whatever blunders or follies might be discerned in other parts of his conduct. But not only is no such desire visible in this proclamation, but the very contrary feeling is marked with unmistakable plainness. Lord Macaulay, describing the times of the Commonwealth, tells us that the "Puritan hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators: indeed he generally contrived to enjoy the double pleasure of tormenting both spectators and bear." In like manner it is impossible to avoid seeing that Mr. Lincoln declares the slaves in the South free, not because he loves the slaves, but because he hates their masters; and it is equally undeniable, that, should his excitement to insurrection produce the effect which he desires, he, too, will enjoy the double pleasure of tormenting both parties—since the horrors of such a servile war will fall at least as heavily on the poor and unwarlike, though furious negro, as on his wealthier master, who, forewarned as he now is, will not be found altogether without the means of resistance; and, if victorious, can hardly be expected to inflict other than a most fearful chastisement.

But we may go further, and say that not only

does this proclamation show no love for the slaves, but that it rivets their chains, by an express acknowledgment of their lawfulness. It is plain that this proposed emancipation of them in the seceding States can only be proclaimed on the ground that they are lawful property: that, in short, rebels may be deprived of them just as (provided only that confiscation can be enforced) they may of the rest of their property of other kinds.

The measure can have no other foundation in the mind of the President himself; for, if he regarded slavery (as *we*, by the most costly sacrifice ever made by a nation have shown that *we* regard it) as a sin and a crime, he could not propose to relieve the States in rebellion of that guilt, and to appropriate it to those which still honour his authority with loyal and dutiful obedience. He therefore, by this edict, establishes the principle, as far as any words of his can establish it, that slaves are as lawful property as houses or land; and, whatever the abolitionists, who are reported to approve of the proclamation may profess to think, by the establishment of such a principle he proposes to render slavery eternal in every State that shall return to its allegiance before the opening of the coming year. That none will return, and that therefore, so far at least, the proclamation will be inoperative, takes nothing from its guilt and folly. We cannot know whether these considerations have hitherto escaped Mr. Lincoln's notice; but one consideration has manifestly escaped it, which is that this proclamation goes to change entirely the character of the war, as, in one most important point of view, he has hitherto sought to represent it to the European powers. Among the grounds on which the sympathy of Europe, and more especially of Great Britain, for the Federal Government, was at first imperiously claimed was this, that the war which it was waging was a war of Free States against Slaveholding States. Henceforward, if this proclamation is to be effectual, the character of both will be altered. The Southerners will be the Free States: the North will be the land of slavery. Should such a change take place, it will inevitably have a considerable effect on this side of the Atlantic. Hitherto the neutrality professed by England has been real; the view taken of the contest has been one of admirable impartiality—while we have failed to see how, on the principles on which the independence of the United States themselves was originally founded, the right of the Secessionist States to claim a separate independence of their own, can be logically denied, we at the same time have acknowledged it to be natural that the Washington Government should be slow to recognize such a right, should be unwilling to acquiesce in their territory suffering so large a diminution; seeing in that diminution a loss of power, and wealth, and influence to themselves, just as even Lord Chatham resisted to the last the recognition of American independence as a death-blow to English greatness; and if the organs of public opinion in England, whether orators or journalists, have from time to time expressed a belief that the time for pacification had arrived, it was because, judging from what happened to ourselves in a similar case, they saw, and see, that, in such a contest, triumph for

the North is hopeless, and that several millions of people resolved to be independent are too large a body to be kept in subjection by any exertion of military power. But should Mr. Lincoln's proclamation ever prove anything but a mere form of empty words—should any Secessionist States come over to him—should slavery, in consequence, be formally adopted as a settled and active principle of the Washington Government, it is manifest that the view with which the English people will thenceforth regard the merits of the contest will be greatly altered; and that the abhorrence of slavery, which in this happy land is no simulated nor partial feeling, will have a great, if not a preponderating, influence on the decision which our Government may next year be forced to form on the already agitated question of the recognition of the Southern States as, what not the least considered member of the Cabinet has already ventured to call them, a separate nation.

The Conscience Clause.

 HE Committee of the National Society professes great horror of a "Conscience Clause." The Secretary assures us that the only bar to its compulsory introduction by the Committee of Council, is the adoption by Churchmen of that interpretation of the terms of union, which we repudiate as new and strange. But has the Committee of the National Society or their Secretary asked themselves what a "Conscience Clause" really is? It is a provision to overrule the conscience of the founders, managers, and teachers of a school, by the conscience of a parent who may wish to take his own advantage of their services in the instruction of his child. One man conscientiously thinks that there ought to be no other binding rule for the religious instruction of the scholars than the reading of the Bible. He is free to devote his money and his time to the founding or managing schools on that footing. He may incorporate his principle in a Trust-deed which shall be binding on all who come after him. This is the practice of the British and Foreign School Society, and the Committee of Council never dreams of interfering with it. No one is listened to who wants to send his child to such a school without learning the Bible, or who requires his child to be taught the Catechism there. Either demand would be contrary to the principles of the school and the conscience of those who established it. Another man conscientiously thinks it right to teach the Catechism and the Liturgy in addition to the Bible. He wishes to devote his money and labour to a Church School, and he provides regulations to effect his object in like manner. This is—or this *was*—the principle and the practice of the National Society. But the Committee of Council refuses to allow to these consciences the liberty enjoyed by the other class. It sets up against them the possible conscience of some unknown parent. It objects to any rule or regulation for securing a Church education. It demands the insertion of a clause by which any one shall be entitled to share all the secular benefits of a Church School, while rejecting the religious teaching

which formed the sole object of its foundation. This is the "Conscience Clause." It proceeds on the assumption that Churchmen have no conscience in asserting their distinctive teaching, and in demanding, as of right, that they be free to give it without suffering loss of grant thereby, but that every one is conscientious in rejecting the teaching, and in denying the demand.

Now how does the Committee of the National Society meet this move of the Committee of Council? It continues—for the present—to oppose the insertion of a "Conscience Clause" in the Trust-deeds. So far so good. The conscience of Churchmen is not to be overruled in express terms. But how about the regulations, on the other hand, to secure the free action of that conscience? These are simply to be *disallowed in every form and shape*. This is the object of the recent "explanations" of the Terms of Union: this is Mr. Lonsdale's notable bar to a compulsory introduction of the Conscience Clause. No such provision is to be inserted in the Trust-deed: this is the *dictum* of the Memorandum dated 23rd of July, 1860. It must not be made a rule by the managers; this is the extension of that *dictum* by the Committee of Council in the Colchester case. It is contrary to "the law of the Church!"—this is the ruling laid down in Mr. Lonsdale's Letter of the 5th of Dec. 1860. It must be left to the discretion of the clergyman: this is the latest decree of the National Society's Committee on the 7th of July last. Now let us see the practical working of these successive concessions to the enemy. Up to the 23rd of July, 1860, a school manager might have replied to a parent, that to omit the Catechism was contrary to the law of the Church and the Terms of Union with the National Society. These defences are now struck away; he can only say it is against the wishes of the clergyman of the parish. The parent then attacks the clergyman; he cannot plead the law of the Church; the great Church Society has cut away the ground from under his feet; he cannot plead the Terms of Union, the Committee in London disowns them; he has no school rule to fall back upon, the Committee of Council will not allow one to be made. He must take the *onus* on his own private feeling, and say, "I do not choose it." Then the parent's "conscience" is overruled by "priestly tyranny." He complains to the Committee of Council; the Lord President thinks it a hard case, and good-natured Mr. Walpole suggests that "some rule should be devised to prevent these cases of injustice!" No doubt of it! if it were *true*, that the application were admissible by the law of the Church, by the Terms of Union, and by the rules of the school, it would be *very* hard to allow a single clergyman, who neither founded the school nor pays the teachers, to refuse it on his own private "discretion." What clergyman would like to fight such a battle? And how long would he be allowed to fight it after a general recognition of the new interpretation? But if he is compelled to yield, then the "Conscience Clause" is established exactly as the Committee of Council desire. The conscience of founder, managers, and teachers is overruled by the dissenting parent; only it is not done openly by a rule which might secure some

respect, but by bullying a clergyman out of his duty.

Now would the Committee of the National Society protest against a result like this? On the contrary, this is the very result they are driving at. No man, or set of men, has done so much *for* the "Conscience Clause" as the Committee of the National Society, and their Secretary, have done in the last two years. If they expected *or wished* the clergyman to stand fast, it would save a world of trouble to say so in plain English; but this is just what they will not do. It was because the Terms of Union were understood to say so, that they have invented an "explanation" to rob them of their natural meaning. By the new dogma there is to be no power anywhere of *securing* the Church teaching. Founders, managers, subscribers, clergymen, and bishop, all united, cannot say, "This is our rule, and those who do not like it may found another school of their own." The sore must be kept open, the knocker going; there must always be the chance of beating the parson some day. There may come a sporting clergyman, or one who hates to be bothered, or a "liberal" with an eye to a deanery from an enlightened government, and then the conscience of all who have a real interest in the school goes to the wall at the pleasure of a parson who has perhaps contributed nothing to the work, and laughs at the bigotry of those who gave their time and money to its foundation.

In saying this is the object which the Committee of the National Society has in view we can anticipate an indignant denial on the part of some of its members: but those gentlemen should look a little sharper after what is said and done in their Committee-room. Not only is this the necessary result of the policy there initiated, but it is avowed and gloried in. Mr. Lonsdale takes no pains to conceal that by preserving the clergyman's "discretion" he means preserving the chance of his waiving the Church teaching. And what did the Committee mean when at their last special meeting in July they expressed their satisfaction at the good which arises from the exercise of this discretion? Does not that show that they *wish* the clergyman to give way, though (for the moment) they object to a clause which should compel him?

Really, gentlemen, the clergy do not want their discretion "preserved"—in *pots*, tied down and labelled in the Broad Sanctuary. Your Secretary's clever "bar" to the compulsory introduction of a Conscience Clause is marvellously like the butler's policy who leaves his pantry window open to save his master's doors from being smashed by the burglars. It was a pretty device, though the London detective took a different view of the intention.

Let us be honest, we say, before all things. The Conscience Clause may have its friends; it certainly has ourselves for its opponents. But it is the *thing* not the *name* that we object to. If the Committee of the National Society *mean* what their Secretary writes, let them abolish the Terms of Union, go for a new Charter, and accept the Conscience Clause without disguise. Then Churchmen can act for themselves; but it is not creditable to see a committee of bishops and dignitaries opposing a measure while they admit its principle, main-

taining Terms of Union of which they deny the obvious signification, and setting country clergymen to fight a battle with their right hands tied up.

We write thus plainly in order to force the subject on the attention of the Committee. Every one knows how often a little knot of members act as "the Committee;" how easily a snug coterie is persuaded to regard as a clever bit of policy what to people out of doors looks very like treachery; how stubbornly officials entrench themselves against remonstrances from mere subscribers. But the matter is getting serious: no sensible man doubts that a mistake has been made, and the sooner it is acknowledged the better for the Society's character and funds. Why should the bishops wish to bring us all up in arms at the next anniversary? Cannot they call a general meeting and discuss the question while it may be done amicably? Or, better still, cannot they prevent further discussion by doing the right thing at once? The mischief has been greatly increased by the Secretary's letters. To contend that "*the children*" does not mean "*all the children*," and that "*all the children*" is different from "*all the children without exception*," is simply contemptible as a piece of logic: if supposed to indicate a "policy" the trifling becomes alarming. Then (as Sir John Coleridge has well observed) "*the Catechism does not mean all the Catechism, nor the Bible all the Bible, nor the Lord's Day every Lord's Day. Psha!*"

The defence of the Committee should have been that the passage first complained of in the Memorandum of the 23rd of July, 1860, was a mistake, incautiously advanced in discussion with the Committee of Council, and unfairly taken up and extended by their lordships in the Colchester case. It was only to say this to the Council Office and to the Society and the discussion would have been quashed. This *must* be said after all, though the Secretary has rendered it more difficult by his injudicious letters. No one, out of Downing Street, will thank him for telling us that children not having sponsors cannot be taught the Catechism. Is this also to be turned into an authorized exposition and made a condition of the public grant? Or does Mr. Lonsdale think it his duty to act as general referee on all rubrical and ecclesiastical questions?

It is time to put a stop to this: the case is too plain for further argument. Difficult as some people may have made it for themselves, the Committee has but one course to pursue if their Association is to continue the School Society of the Church of England.

The Use and Abuse of Party.



THE operation of parliamentary parties is frequently and fully discussed in the writings of Lord Bolingbroke and Edmund Burke. And it is a curious circumstance that these two eminent statesmen should have arrived at exactly opposite conclusions on this momentous subject. To Bolingbroke party seemed a monster. To Burke it seemed one of the happiest contrivances which human ingenuity could devise for the

conduct of Constitutional Government. These two great men, it must be owned, enjoyed unequal opportunities of testing the real nature of party. Bolingbroke, more essentially a man of action than Burke, looking only to the facts of the period, and finding a very ugly set of facts before him, never paused to reflect whether the abuses which he then witnessed might not be the ungainly movements of a new system just struggling into life, and not, as he thought, the inaugural symptoms of a new æra of corruption. Fifty years later our two great political parties were getting well into harness; the capabilities of the system were better understood: and it had become apparent to most thinking men that it constituted at once the best security for a strong government, and at the same time the steadiest barrier against the despotism of a single individual, whether subject or sovereign. Still, there can be no doubt that many of those evils which Bolingbroke saw so clearly, however much thrown into the shade by the development of still greater advantages, are inherent in the nature of party government, and ready to break forth again whenever the weakness of Parliament shall tempt the lurking malady to show itself.

The one abuse of party which assumed such gigantic proportions in the eyes of the great Tory statesman was the facility which it afforded to a particular set of men to accomplish their own ends at the expense of the national welfare. No political party, he thought, could regard the whole nation from the same lofty and disinterested point of view as a king could. Without stopping to argue the feasibility or non-feasibility of "*The Patriot King*," or to compare the evils of Party with the evils of Absolutism, we may say at once that there is truth in the objection here raised: and a truth which has not lost its vitality even in our own times. The legal and ecclesiastical appointments, for instance, of the last fifteen years would not probably have been made even by Lord Russell, and certainly not by Lord Palmerston, had they been unfettered by party connections. These appointments, then, were not for the public good, but for the good of the Whigs; and are perfectly fair illustrations of the mischiefs pointed out by Lord Bolingbroke. Again, an analogous evil is the necessity under which Lord Palmerston has felt himself to retain Mr. Gladstone as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Why has he been obliged to do this? Simply because he cannot throw himself upon the good sense of the House at large, but must consult the wishes and the interests of only little more than one half of it.

But there is yet another evil inseparable from the existence of party to which Bolingbroke was naturally blind, but which he might very readily have detected in the proceedings of his own friends. A party, we must remember, is not a mere war armament. It must be kept up in time of peace; or, in other words, when no great political differences are agitating the minds of men. During such intervals of quiet there is always great danger lest party bonds should be relaxed, party allegiance wax cold, and a general languor seize upon the whole connection. These dangers must be combated by every means at the disposal of party

leaders. The machine must be kept in working order : and we know how, too often, this is done. Sham fights, bloodless field days, and a vast deal of noise and smoke are as necessary to the parliamentary soldier as they are to the real one. Hence what is so truly described, yet so unfairly reproached, as "vexatious opposition:" the fact being that if we had no opposition that was not vexatious we should very soon have none at all. Yet it cannot be denied that vexatious opposition is an evil ; as it tends to obscure one's perception of great principles, and causes skill in the concoction of differences to attract much of the admiration which is due only to higher gifts. But statesmen are in this difficulty. They must hold their party together. And so, where no great difference exists between themselves and their rivals, they are tempted, some would say compelled, out of very loyalty to the trust reposed in them, either to exaggerate a trivial or to create a fictitious antagonism.

But, after all, perhaps the most glaring abuse of party, and that which comes home most forcibly to the popular mind, is the confusion of ends with means which it engenders, and the employment of party organization, not to reform our policy, but merely to change our rulers. A party which has been long in office conceives itself to have acquired a kind of divine right to power, and, if ejected, seeks at once to restore itself, not for the sake of any principle, but in the assertion of a traditional prerogative. This, as we say, is one of the worst abuses of which the system of party is susceptible. It was exemplified in the conduct of the Whigs in 1783, when they had not yet recovered from the effects of their long lease of power under the two first Georges ; and again by the successful combination against Lord Derby in 1859. In each of these cases the opposition was a shameless avowal of unqualified party motives. In neither had the opposing party any definite policy to offer in exchange for that of the party to be superseded. They proclaimed in so many words that might was right. Their party organization enabled them in the one case all but, and in the other quite, to win the day, simply for themselves as a party ; for no particular principle or policy, but merely for the tradition which associated their names with Government. Of course, a fight of this kind is waged with far more *esprit de corps* than one in which principles are at stake. Many a Tory might have doubted the wisdom of resisting Roman Catholic Emancipation. Many a Whig may have blushed at the hypocrisy of Lord John Russell's Reform Bills. But no Tory could doubt that the Tories, no Whig that the Whigs, ought to occupy the Treasury Benches. The existence of party, therefore, has an obvious tendency to make party an end in itself, and to subordinate to it what ought to take precedence of it, namely, great measures of administration, and broad principles of government. To place the Whigs in office, or the Tories in office, becomes with many good men an end sufficient in itself, and worth attaining at any cost whatever of administrative anarchy or stagnation. No doubt such an end is in the abstract worth pursuing for its own sake, because the presence of our own party in office is the best guarantee we can have for the

ascendancy of our own principles. But these ends are to be pursued with some discretion ; and where our own principles do not appear to be in immediate danger, we are not justified in vindicating our party supremacy at any vast expenditure of public convenience. Every member of a party should enter into a kind of tacit compromise with himself. Generally speaking, and in the long run, he will of course believe that government by his own party is for the good of the country. But he will acknowledge that times and circumstances may occur in which it is right for him to abstain from pushing his creed into practice : when more good will accrue to the public by the cessation of party warfare than harm by the temporary domination of the rival party. He who refuses to allow the force of such times and circumstances abuses party even to making it stink in the public nostrils. He who *does* allow them need never be afraid of avowing himself a party-man, in the fullest and least qualified sense.

Another drawback on the system of party has to be allowed its due weight, though it is perhaps questionable whether it have not compensating advantages. As no chain can be stronger than its weakest part, so no party can be wiser than its dullest. It must wait for its laggards, or else run an imminent risk either of being broken to pieces itself, or of destroying its too precipitate propeller. Several of our first statesmen have been lost to the public service for years through being in advance of their party, yet unable to work by themselves. More than one great measure of reform has been dangerously retarded through the same cause. And once at least has a splendid and compact party been shivered into fragments because its leader would insist on movement without deference to the rank and file of his supporters. At the same time we must remember that we are indebted to these very conditions for that mature consideration, and frequent discussion, of great changes which satisfy the people of their wisdom. Party is the drag-chain of Government, and though on looking back into history we can see that in some instances it would have been better had reforms been accomplished earlier, yet it may be doubted if we do not gain more than we lose by waiting till political changes have had time to commend themselves to the general common sense of the nation.

This is, we believe, a fair statement of the abuses to which party is liable. It may be said, however, that party, so abused, is not party in the legitimate meaning of the word, but faction ; party, no doubt, means organized association for the maintaining and promoting of certain principles. Many individuals hold the same principles, and believe, severally, that the public good will then only be best cared for when these principles are in the ascendant. To this end, therefore, they unite in counsel and in act ; and a true party man is one ; who, 1st, subordinates private to public interests ; 2dly, who is content, so far as he finds it possible, to submit his own judgment to that of his party, where the two do not coincide, on the grounds that a collective judgment has better claims to be heard than an individual judgment, and that his severing himself from his party may compromise or endanger the general ascendancy of its principles, which is, after all, *the*

thing to be first cared for. The man who lays down these rules for himself, and acts upon them steadily, is just the man to carry weight and command respect when he is compelled to dissociate himself from his party in any particular case.

We have now to consider what, in the face of such abuses as those to which party is exposed, are the virtues which perpetuate its existence, and still entitle it to our support. Its merits, we may say at once, very greatly outweigh its defects. Foremost among the former we should reckon its moral influence both with its own members and with its adversaries. Party and party alone has the power to make minorities respectable: and is the only means existing in this country of redressing that alleged injustice to which Mill and his fellow-thinkers have given currency. The speech of an individual in the House of Commons, however able, carries little immediate weight with it. But the opposition of a regular party is always shunned by a minister, though he may be certain of victory in the lobby. From this first conclusion it is easy to deduce the second, that party offers almost the only security which is possible against the dictatorship of an ambitious minister. The Government must always gather round itself some kind of Parliamentary following, and, in the absence of any other organized "connection" in the House, this will always be sufficient to ensure victory in the long run. The Ministerial party, under these circumstances, resembles a small body of regular troops in the midst of an undisciplined population. And, allowing for those additional supporters who are attracted towards it by inclination or conviction, we see that the tumultuous array opposed to it on any great question would have but very slight chances of success. Give a minister a hundred men in the House of Commons on whom he could depend with certainty, and prevent the formation of any other organized body accustomed to act together, and to obey the commands of one man, and you make him dictator for his life, barring, of course, the rise of such tremendous questions as create civil wars and revolutions. On most ordinary questions it would be difficult, under such circumstances, if not impossible, to collect three hundred men together in opposition to Government, however rash or injurious the character of its legislation. Those men only would oppose it who had an immediate interest in the matter, or some special acquaintance with the subject. The others would not take the trouble. And so, night after night and year after year, the Cabinet measures might be carried till misgovernment reached that pitch at which violent remedies become possible. Not only, therefore, does party lend a weight to minorities which they never could possess without it, but it is often the only possible machinery for making even a majority effective. It is conceivable that there should be a majority of the House of Commons of which every unit was illdisposed towards the minister, yet whom nothing could persuade to act together but the stimulus of party discipline. The abuse of this stimulus we have already pointed out; we are now concerned only with the use of it. And this one use is alone more than sufficient to outweigh the objections we have enumerated. It prevents Kings and ministers from

acting on the maxim of *divide et impera*, which was obviously the means by which Bolingbroke intended to reconcile a patriot Monarch with a free Parliament. And it was an intuitive perception of the same truth which prompted George the Third in the beginning of his reign to proclaim a crusade against party. Later in life he grew wiser, and found in this suspected system the safest bulwark of his throne, and the readiest means of carrying on his government.

Thirdly, there are few men of whom it can be said with justice that they give up to party talents intended for mankind. It is very well when they do not give up to themselves talents intended for their party. We all know the old definition of an independent member—a member upon whom nobody can depend. What we mean is that men do more real good, are more useful members of Parliament, when they act in connection with a party, than when they act in solitary independence. Crotchets are gradually worked out of them; they are brought under the yoke of common sense; and are compelled to see things in a popular and practical light. Moreover they learn sobriety and moderation; for no man, whom circumstances may at no remote period transform into a minister, dares be otherwise than moderate and sober. Many men, too, under the inspection of an able leader are discovered to have latent capabilities which they had not understood, and which but for party exigencies might never have been developed. Finally, it cannot be disputed that the system of party corrects the selfish tendencies of public life, and leads a man to work more disinterestedly for a great cause than he was likely to have done without it. The virtues of generosity and fidelity are largely called forth by party action, as well as those of self-control and self-denial in the consultation by which it is preceded.

Such are the virtues and such are the vices inherent in that political system which is verging on the completion of the second century of its existence. The vices are the more numerous, and, as they lie more upon the surface, are more conspicuous to the public eye. But the virtues of party are interwoven with the very roots of our Parliamentary Government, and we believe that any attempt to eradicate the one must, if successful, involve the destruction of the other.

The Recent Scottish Synod.



It has been long known that one main purpose in holding a General Synod of the Scottish Church was that the National Liturgy might at least be declared to be no longer of primary authority, if not altogether abolished—in the hope that when this obstacle to the removal of disabilities was out of the way, relief, as a matter of course, might be sought from and granted by Parliament. Since the first session, however, which was held in the summer, one or two important changes have taken place in the position of affairs, which have had a most material effect in hindering the work which, as it now appears, only a very small section in Scotland heartily desires to

see completed. Five out of seven of the diocesan Synods, viz. those of Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Moray, S. Andrews, and Brechin, have declared in favour of retaining the Scotch Office, and of allowing new congregations, hereafter to be formed, to use either it or the English; thus giving fair play to the supporters of both, and practically renouncing the scheme of abolition, which experienced such intense opposition both in Scotland and here. Again, some of our leading theologians have strongly urged the retention of the National Office on very grave and intelligible grounds; whilst certain eminent politicians of different sides of the house—amongst whom may be mentioned Sir William Heathcote, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Frederick Lygon, and Mr. Hubbard—have openly declared their inability and indisposition to assist in removing the disabilities, if the Scottish Communion Office was deliberately set aside. These two facts, then, had their weight when the adjourned General Synod reassembled in Edinburgh on the 30th of September.

Immediately prior to this period the Bishop of Edinburgh, who is infirm and unable to fulfil his duties, asked the Episcopal College for a coadjutor, and obtained an immediate compliance with his request. The mandate was issued, the election took place, and Mr. Ramsay, the Dean of Edinburgh, was elected by a majority of three over the other candidate—the Rev. L. S. Orde. After this result, however, and on the actual eve of the General Synod, Dean Ramsay formally but respectfully declined the office.

Thus the Upper Chamber, which numbers only seven when all the Bishops are present, consisted only on this occasion of six. Three of these—the Bishops of Argyle, Aberdeen, and Glasgow—were known to be in favour of abolishing the National Office; while the other three—the Bishops of Moray (Primus), Brechin, and S. Andrews—were in favour of retaining it. So that the latter proposition would infallibly have been carried by the casting-vote of the Primus. This was seen by the other side, and a series of proposals for adjournment were agreed upon by a majority, (for the Bishop of S. Andrews appears on this occasion to have gone over to the abolition section,) and sent down to the Lower Chamber for their consideration. The Lower Chamber, by a decided majority, respectfully declined to adjourn, and communicated the result by their Prolocutor to the Upper. After this decision, which appears to have been disliked by the Upper—the majority of which desired that a Bishop of Edinburgh's presence might counteract or render needless the casting-vote of the Primus—a second proposal, as follows, was agreed to by the same majority:—"That in the present defective state of the Upper Chamber, as to numbers, we are not in a position to discuss so organic a question as that of the introduction of the laity; and that the Upper Chamber, having ascertained that the motion this morning for adjournment was negatived in the Lower Chamber by a majority comparatively less than that of the opposite majority in the Upper Chamber; and that the minority in the Lower Chamber feel themselves aggrieved that the due authority of the rulers of the Church should be compromised by the concession which the Bishops

have made—the Upper Chamber having *reconsidered the question of adjournment, desire to withdraw the said concession*, and to communicate again to the Lower Chamber the resolution which they have passed in favour of adjournment." This was proposed by the Bishop of Aberdeen and seconded by the Bishop of Argyle.

On this strange proposition we may just remark, that the Upper Chamber, by having first consulted the Lower Chamber, had practically—as they were obviously bound to do—admitted that the Lower Chamber possessed a co-ordinate power in determining such an important point. Secondly, the existing canons expressly provide for the accidental absence of a Bishop, and direct that, if he be necessarily absent, he shall send his opinion in writing for the guidance of his colleagues, but shall have no vote. Thirdly, the majority of the Upper Chamber—viz. the Bishops of S. Andrews, Argyle, Aberdeen, and Glasgow—formed the above resolution on a communication from certain members of the Lower Chamber in their private capacity, and not in a regular message or deliverance sent up by the Prolocutor—a piece of irregularity which, as the Dean of Edinburgh remarked, placed him, as Prolocutor, in a very unpleasant position. Fourthly, after the Lower Chamber had in the first instance refused to adjourn, and the Upper Chamber had agreed to proceed, *and had actually passed canons*, it appears to be the height of childishness to propose to "withdraw their concession." And so it was considered on all hands.

Again, it should be especially remarked that the express reason for proposing to delay was that the question of the introduction of the laity could not be considered in the absence of the Bishop of Edinburgh. All these points, of course, were more or less duly considered by the Lower Chamber, but not until after the majority of the Upper Chamber, in the teeth of a protest of the Primus and the Bishop of Brechin, had attempted, in a most undignified manner, to adjourn the Lower Chamber by what we may almost call physical force. The Primus felt so strongly that the two chambers possessed co-ordinate rights, that he respectfully declined to adjourn the Synod (which the aforesaid majority had resolved to accomplish), and so vacated his primatial chair. This was taken by the Bishop of Argyle, who immediately asked a conference of the Lower Chamber, and then at once, to their intense astonishment, pronounced the adjournment of the Synod, and, taking up the Prayer-book said, "It only remains for me, therefore, to pronounce the benediction—'The grace of our Lord.'" This attempt was promptly met by loud cries of "order," "shame," and other expostulations, which, if we may judge by the newspaper reports, somewhat astonished Dr. Ewing, who desisted, and then the Lower House was heard, through its members, in opposition to such an unheard-of attempt. The Dean of Edinburgh spoke with great effect, and the admirable conduct of the Primus in a most trying situation appears to have been generally remarked. The Bishop of S. Andrews is said to have been the author of all these difficulties; for he desired more time to ventilate his peculiar theory of a revision of the Scotch Office, and left no stone

unturned, either with those of his brethren in the Upper Chamber whom he is known to lead, or with those persons in the Lower House over whom he possesses an influence. The Lower Chamber, however, still remained resolute as to maintaining their co-ordinate rights, and refused to succumb to the proposition of the Bishops of Aberdeen and Argyle. The result was a complete dead-lock, twice repeated, and a state of affairs which was anything but creditable to those who deliberately brought it about. All these, and other facts are set forth in the *Daily Edinburgh Courant* for the week during which the Synod sat, and have certainly not tended to elevate the character of the Scottish Church in the eyes of the members of the various Presbyterian communities.

But the most unaccountable fact of all yet remains to be told. The Lower Chamber, after distinctly maintaining their own co-ordinate and other rights, admitting that the bishops in their administrative capacity have power to summon a Synod, but denying that they have power, sitting as a Legislative Chamber, *without the concurrence of the Deans and Diocesan Delegates*, to adjourn it, offered to consent to an adjournment on condition that, before such adjournment had taken place, canons admitting the laity and non-instituted clergy to vote at the election to Bishops be passed. This was done with a view to the expected election of a coadjutor for the diocese of Edinburgh, where the laity are very desirous of exercising the power they have now obtained. To this, notwithstanding what had already been said, the majority of the Upper House consented, (the Bishop of Aberdeen protesting, and the Bishops of Argyle and Glasgow declining to act); so that the Upper House has deliberately acted in the teeth of its first proposition, and two Canons giving the laity a right so to vote have been formally enacted. The question of the Scotch Office has been shelved for a time; because it is hoped to bring private influence to bear on the Delegates who support it; and in order to give time to the Bishop of S. Andrews, in the pages of his recognized organ, the *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*, to agitate for a revision of the Office, in order to bring it into conformity with his Opinion of Nov. 5, which denies the Real Presence, and teaches the eccentric doctrine of Virtualism.

We cannot but hope that on this important question delay may be, after all, for the advantage of those who desire to walk in the ancient ways; and that reflection* may induce many who have opposed the retention of the National Office to change their line of action. It will be a great discredit that our sister Church of the North should deliberately give up a sacred deposit like that which she retains—which the great Bishop Horsley so nobly defended—which is identical with the Liturgy of the American Church—which is distinctly founded on the model of St. James's Liturgy, and which is moreover a sound, if but a single link between East and West.

But the one practical lesson which we would offer

* Dr. Rorison, of Peterhead, a strong opponent of the Scotch Office, has, it is reported, written to Dean Ramsay, proposing to retain the Scotch Office as of equal authority, because he has now discovered that the English M.P.'s and others will do nothing to remove the disabilities—Dr. Rorison's great aim—if the National Office is abolished.

from a consideration of the recent brief Session of the General Scotch Synod is, that the unfilled ancient Sees should again be occupied. Ross, the Isles, Dunkeld, Dumblane, the Orkneys and Caithness should all have bishops. If this were so, one prelate, however resolute, would be less likely to be so successful in producing a desired dead-lock, as was the case at Edinburgh in the first week of October.

The Lost Characters of English "Liberalism."



HE representation of the metropolitan boroughs is under a cloud. It is difficult to see how any extension of the franchise could even turn into Parliament worse sort of members than Edwin James and William Roupell. Agitators, who were criminals long before they had exhibited all their crimes, were suffered to refer to the public advantages which they meant to confer. That criticism was not even allowed to be pure which took exception to the motives of these irresistible pretenders. We were told, with a rather well simulated seeming of irritable indignation, that aristocratic jealousy was at the bottom of any opposition to the splendid claims of William Roupell, and the uncompromising honesty of Edwin James. It was no good to point to past experience. The answer was, "They are the men of the people. They are sent to Parliament as some guarantee that there shall be no waste in the public expenditure; they go there to restore the balance to the side of popular right, and to stand by the assaulted prerogative of civil and religious liberty." With the examples that have lately scandalized the country it is not easy to doubt about the probabilities of an extended franchise increasing the evil. The constituencies that made much of the glory of being under the protection of Mr. Roupell or Mr. James could scarcely go lower for a cause of self-congratulation; but to have had them as instances has done nothing serviceable for the dignity of Parliament—to have them multiplied would go far to bring into contempt the House of Commons. There have been very indifferent specimens of "the people's man" in other directions; but we cannot see that the level of metropolitan representation has anywhere else been absolutely reached. In any future re-adjustment of the franchise it would be for statesmen to consider how far the choice of such constituencies as Marylebone and Lambeth should affect the *maximum* of the privilege they might safely yield; and, although such warnings could not with propriety be lost sight of, they would probably be treated as exceptions which might be reproduced elsewhere, but which even then should not be held to express the prospective debasement of other constituencies. This may be the judgment of those who may have privileges to bestow; but we do not see how it can decently become any part of the prayer of those who ask to be further trusted.

We do not, however, mean at all to infer that either Mr. Edwin James or Mr. Roupell became criminals because they were "Liberals." We do not intend to make political capital out of the cell of

a convict, or out of the American conclusions to Mr. James's career; but it does seem to us that the attitude of these two men in the boroughs they have so degraded was almost a beginning of their later crimes. The candidate who comes quite up to all the requirements of a metropolitan borough must be content to be suspected by those who may reasonably enough believe that he whose "platform" stops at nothing, has already made up his mind to tamper with the formula to which he commits himself so readily. A man who takes pledges into his mouth which he never means to redeem, does not unnaturally come to put to paper another man's name when the occasion presses. We do not intend to say that the larger crime follows the lesser one as a matter of course; but when it does ensue we cannot see that it so follows illogically. Mr. Roupell and Mr. James, and even Mr. Humphrey Brown, of the British Bank, preferred their claims as "the men of the people," as "the friends of retrenchment and reform," as the proper protectors of "the great cause of civil and religious liberty." As simply honest men it might have been very natural that they should have believed in the cries they urged; but the evil is in this, that the situation does not call for the necessity for their believing in any of them. A man must take upon his lips the programme as it is delivered to him by the clique that has brought him out. He is measured by the quantity of his professions. If he hesitates over any pledge, he betrays an unfitness for the work that he wants to do; and if he stops to be honest he only stays to be rejected. That they should become afterwards insignificant is easily to be understood; but that they should so often disappear as lost characters, with no followers but a detective and a sheriff's officer, and that they should have ever been recognized by the "Liberal" party, remains to be explained by English "Liberalism." We do not say that because of their "Liberalism" we have been called on to part from them. But it is very certain that amongst the Constitutional party there has been no such parallel fall. This may, of course, be the merest accident; we certainly do not introduce it as a party inference; but it does not seem to us that the man—whatever political connection he may be associated with—who commits himself to any pledge that may secure his election, but which he may very particularly despise, is not exactly out of training for such a career as that of William Roupell, Humphrey Brown, or Edwin James. Take, for example, one of the most estimable of men now amongst us, in all the relations of his private life, Mr. Western Wood, one of the members for the city of London. The election of this gentleman for the constituency he represents turned upon the question of his support or opposition to Church-rate. He must "pledge" himself to support its abolition. He had "conscientious objections" to vote against the rate; but it happened to be necessary that he should get over them; and, as it was near four o'clock when he was called upon to decide, he took the "pledge" to which he could only outwardly subscribe. When the House divided, during the late session, Mr. Western Wood was "conspicuous for his absence." The "pledge" that carried him against the Lord

Mayor ensured his success, and will achieve his fall. An immoral system is at the bottom of all this, stealing the country's life-blood and self-respect.

We might afford to think less of these lost characters in a public point of view, if the condition of the representation of the metropolitan boroughs was likely to be at all improved. We do not apprehend that another "people's man" will be called upon to plead to perjury and forgery again just yet; but we are clear that the great constituencies of Middlesex and Surrey have lost influence. The onus of mending things at present lies clearly with the "Liberals"—the "lost characters" are theirs by their own confession. We have heard Mr. Nicholay—who detests all aristocratic influences, but takes care to proclaim over his shop to what patricians he sells his furs—is to be brought forward for Marylebone; but other rumours will have it, that, as the member-maker of that borough, to send him to Parliament would be to bring about an anti-climax in his career; and there are not wanting those who talk of Mr. Miall, or Mr. Mudie, for Westminster. Callous people may smile, but it concerns the country to take care of the consequences. The House of Commons has been lately called upon to bear too much. A man of mere mediocrity is legitimately a representative man, or a large class might with reason say that they are not represented. But when Parliament sends back criminals from its companionship, people begin to ask whether the system and the policy which have made it so easy for them to find their way into it be not mistakes.

England and her Colonies.



HERE is a well-known charm in paradoxes. They produce a greater sensation than truths which present themselves in a simple form; and a somewhat similar charm attaches to the promulgation of views which run entirely counter to the general sentiment of the community. Accordingly, a considerable stir was produced, not indeed among practical politicians, but amongst the more impressible circles of literature, when Mr. Goldwin Smith, speaking from a Professor's chair in the University of Oxford, proclaimed that our Colonial policy was an utter mistake, and that the sooner England got quit of her colonies the better. The doctrine, indeed, was not new—it was a pet notion of the ultra-Radicals in this country a quarter of a century ago. But when propounded anew, and with great earnestness, people were more willing to give ear to it—first, on account of the academic status of Mr. Smith, who, as Professor of History in one of our two great Universities, might naturally be accredited with a wide knowledge of, and sound judgment in, the affairs of national life; and, secondly, because recent conduct on the part of some of our colonies was giving rise to much dissatisfaction in the minds of the British public.

But there is nothing like free discussion for the elucidation of truth. Perhaps the most important of the many learned papers read before the recent meeting of the British Association was the

one contributed by Mr. Hermann Merivale, in virtual (though not express) refutation of Professor Smith's doctrines of colonial policy. Mr. Merivale has long held a high position in the Colonial Office, and the whole of his essay on the *Utility of Colonization* bears the impress of a practical man. One has only to compare his essay with the writings of Mr. Smith on the same subject, to see that Merivale is a statesman, and Smith a doctrinaire.

One peculiar aspect of this question is, that the drawbacks on our colonial system are of such a kind as to be obvious to every one, while the solid character of the advantages is only apparent to those who carefully consider the case. The most common charges against the supporters of our present Colonial policy has been that they are sentimentalists. It is taken for granted by Mr. Smith, and others who think with him, that all the material arguments are on their side, and they consider that the only argument brought forward by their opponents is a sentiment in favour of upholding the unity and grandeur of the empire. "You sacrifice the substance for the shadow," is the retort of the Smithian party: "the colonies are only an expense to the mother country; and if you throw them off, the British empire, though immensely smaller, will in reality be more powerful than ever." There is nothing so tangible as money; a disadvantage which can be expressed in pounds, shillings, and pence looms large, and eclipses all others in general estimation. And the argument against the retention of our colonies rests upon this strong and potent ground. It costs us so much a year to provide for the government and defence of our colonies, and (says Mr. Smith) we, notwithstanding, do not get a single advantage from them which we would not equally get from an independent state. The arguments on the other side do not exhibit themselves so glaringly, nor do they come home to ordinary people with the same concentrated force; but we take leave to think that they in reality far outweigh the others, and constitute the only basis upon which the preference of statesmen can be founded.

The first and most important advantage of colonization consists in the fact of the superior productiveness of capital and labour when applied to a new soil. This is a cosmopolitan advantage,—one which concerns the well-being of mankind at large, rather than the interests of a particular country. At the same time it must be borne in mind that it is this superior productiveness of capital and labour in new soils which forms the great cause of emigration; and, therefore, everything that aids the profitable application of the accumulated knowledge, capital, and labour, of an old country to the production of wealth in a new country increases the flow of emigration. There can be no doubt that, *ceteris paribus*, a man will prefer to emigrate to a new country where he will find the same language, laws, and customs, to which he has been accustomed from his birth. It is also indisputable that any country which forms an integral part of a vast and powerful empire enjoys a greater condition of equilibrium and security than a small and isolated one, which necessarily cannot stand well alone. The former are less liable to be attacked from without, or to be harassed by anarchy within, than the latter;

and, therefore, they present greater inducements for emigration to flow thither from old countries.

But, it may be said, why consider emigration such a benefit? Is it not rather to be regarded as a waste of the national strength—a loss, both as regards labour and capital, on the part of the country from which the emigration proceeds? In certain conditions, which probably have never yet occurred in the world's history, this might be true; but, as a practical question, the opposite is the more correct view. Men do not emigrate unless they are compelled to do so. If they can get on as well as they wish to do in their own country, they will not leave home, friends, and country, in order to make a long journey to a strange region where they will be no better off than before. Therefore emigration only takes place from countries where the labour-market is more or less overstocked, and where, accordingly, a portion of the people cannot live in the state of comfort (whatever that may be) to which they have been accustomed, or to which they think they see their way. Although the remarkable prosperity enjoyed by this country of late years, and still more the great emigration which has taken place, has caused the doctrine of Malthus to be forgotten or discredited, the doctrine is substantially correct. In old countries, at least, population has a natural tendency to multiply faster than the means of subsistence. Unlike manufactures, which may be multiplied to any extent, and at little cost, the produce of the soil cannot be augmented save slowly, and at great expense; whereas population in perfectly favourable circumstances doubles in twenty or twenty-five years. Whenever population increases faster than the wealth of a country—then, either the labour-market becomes overstocked, wages fall from their former level, and the general well-being of the community suffers; or else the too rapid increase of population must be checked by prudential considerations. In the former case, the result is not merely that the mass of the population becomes poorer, but education must decline, and the state must suffer from the growth of an ignorant and semi-pauper population, such as constitutes the *classes dangereuses* of France. In the second case, marriages are contracted at a later period of life, and are less prolific; while the moral condition of the nation becomes deteriorated by a steady increase of prostitution, and by the comparative contempt or dislike with which marriage is regarded. These consequences are such as we should expect of human nature; and they have been amply exemplified of late years in France. The annual average number of births in France has remained stationary since 1815; and, as the population has increased during that period, and marriages are contracted in the same proportion as before, there is evidently a steady decrease going on in the fertility of marriages. Statistics, indeed, prove that the average fecundity of marriages in France from 1822 to 1832 was 3.64 (a fourth less than the average in this country, which is 4.5), it has gradually declined till it now stands at about 3.10.

France has almost no colonies, and there has been no emigration at all from her shores; and there cannot be a doubt that, besides diminishing the natural fertility of marriages, the restlessness produced

by so artificial a state of things has not been without its effect in exciting the population to those revolutions and *émeutes* which have been so painfully frequent. England, on the other hand, has thrown off her swarms by emigration to an unparalleled extent; and the result has been that the proportion of marriages and their average fertility has continued at the normal rate; and, although the population has continued to augment, the comforts of life have increased still faster, and the standard of education has been progressively rising. There cannot be a doubt that this improvement in the comfort and intellectual condition of the working-classes has contributed most materially to produce that rare domestic tranquillity and concord which have so eminently distinguished the last dozen years.

But there is another and, if not more important, at least more patent and palpable advantage in the possession of colonies. English settlers always prefer English goods; our fellow-subjects in Canada and Australia consume an immensely larger proportion per head of British manufacture than any other population in the world. Colonies, also, are less inclined to impose high import duties on the produce of the mother country than rival States are. Like all communities, they must impose taxes to meet their expenditure, and they must consult their own interests in regard to the manner in which those taxes are imposed. Nevertheless, as long as they remain in loyal connection with the mother country, we may rely upon it that the duties which they have to impose upon our produce will be minimized—will be imposed as lightly as possible. That is not a great deal, but is certainly more than we can expect from rival States.

These are reasons for England continuing her present relationship with her colonies. But equally strong ones suggest themselves when we come to consider the eventualities of a disruption. It may be thought an easy matter to “let go” our colonies; it may be thought that such a disruption of the British empire could be effected with perfect good feeling upon both sides. A knowledge of human nature forbids the supposition. The facts of the case, likewise, give it a most peremptory contradiction. There is not a single colony which desires to be cast off; and to break the connection with them, and insist upon their becoming independent, would be like turning your sons out of doors in order to compel them to begin life for themselves. Instead of amicable separation, there would be a bitter feud; the ties of relationship would be effaced by a sense of injury and indignity.

So far, then, from sharing the views of those who desire to see a separation between England and her colonies, we believe the true policy is to preserve the connection, and, at the same time, to seek to organize and consolidate our numerous colonies into groups, so as to make them more able to shift for themselves—thereby lessening their cost to the mother country, and giving to them a feeling of pride, and a sense of power which would make them unwilling to associate themselves as parts of some other, and necessarily rival State. Nay more, in course of time we should even aspire to see these various colonial States combine with the mother

country in a grand political confederacy, which, amidst all the consolidation of States on the Continent, would still keep the British race unsurpassed in power, and the undisputed masters of the sea.

Political Parties in America.



HE majority of educated Englishmen have probably some more or less vague belief that political parties in America form a chaos of cliques and sections to which the subdivisions of our own Parliamentary parties are simplicity itself. They have heard of Hard-shells and Soft-shells, of Coons and Locofocos, of Barnburners, and Know-nothings, and they probably imagine that each one of these ludicrous designations represents a distinct political creed as hard perhaps to understand as the title which denotes it. Such, however, is far from being the case. The two old American parties, which are coeval with the Union, still divide the nation between them. And the above-mentioned epithets signify at most but slight modifications of these, and sometimes are but accidental nicknames, having little if any political or social meaning.

From the first establishment of the United States there appear to have been two well-defined parties in existence with definite and simple principles. One of these would appear to have looked rather to the old nations of Europe for their model of society and government than to the actual condition of America. The other adhered tenaciously to the system which had preceded the rebellion, and wished for nothing more than to perpetuate the same under a central government at Washington, which should exercise little more control over the internal affairs of the States than it had done when its seat was at London. Which of these two parties the constitution really meant to favour it may not be easy to decide. Perhaps it would be true to say that it favoured neither; for it is one of the many vices of a Federal Constitution that it lacks unity of purpose. Each party, of course, has placed that construction on it which suited its own views; and each unquestionably has plausible reasons to assign in behalf of its own interpretation. The first of these two parties has been called the Whig or Federalist party. The second are the Democrats.

The object of the Whig party seems to have been to construct on the American continent a grand republican empire, with an aristocracy, a thoroughly centralised public service, and a regular imperial standing army. They would in time, no doubt, have swamped the provincial constitutions of the States, as completely as the provincial constitutions in France were swamped by the monarchy. But they were resisted from the commencement by the Democrats, who stood up for the independence of the States, and scoffed at the efforts of their opponents to create an aristocracy. Thus it will be seen that the Whigs bore a strong resemblance, in reality as well as in name, to the English Whigs of the eighteenth century, while the Democrats in many respects corresponded to the Tories. The Tories then were opposed to centralization, national

debt, and external aggrandisement, and were at one time at least favourable to free trade. And in all these opinions the Democrats of America coincided.

So stood the two parties throughout that earlier period when as yet the magnitude of the Slave question had not become generally apparent. Politically speaking, there was no reason why the one party more than the other should have been the supporters of slavery. But it so happened that the chief strength of the Democratic party lay in the old States, like Virginia and Carolina, where a race of country gentlemen derived considerable importance from the part which they played in State politics, and entertained all that dislike of centralisation which has distinguished their class in other countries. But these States also were the chief seats of slave labour. And so it fell out that the Pro-slavery party was in politics represented by the Democrats. The converse, however, was not equally true. There were Democrats in the North who were not in favour of slavery. But they differed a good deal among themselves on this particular point. And it was in reference to this dissension that the epithets of Hard-shell and Soft-shell first obtained political significance.

Of course, it is easy to see that the Democratic creed fits in with the interests of the slave-owners more closely than the Federalist creed: for it maintains the complete independence of the separate States, and so fences them in against that imperial interference which the Abolitionist party, if it gained the ascendancy in the Union, might be tempted to undertake. The apparent inconsistency between the two sides of the Democratic creed vanishes upon a moment's reflection. The equality of all men was not originally a doctrine peculiar to the Democrats; it was the very keystone of the whole Constitution. And there is no reason to suppose that the gentry of the Southern States had adopted the doctrine more warmly than the Northern manufacturers. But they saw in the efforts of the Federalists to create an American aristocracy a blow at their provincial constitutions. An American or imperial aristocracy would, of course, cast into the shade the smaller provincial aristocracy. And it was this consummation which the Democrats laboured to avert, deriving their political title from their opposition to an aristocratic party, and not from their profession of what we understand, in this country, by Democratic doctrines. Thus there is no real inconsistency between the political and social creed of the Southern Secessionists. Within the limits of each separate State they would be as aristocratic as you please. But they did not desire to see their own importance extinguished, and perhaps even liberty endangered, by a supreme aristocracy of wealth, which would have a tendency every year to degenerate into a despotic oligarchy. We cannot always tell with certainty which is cause and which is effect in great questions of this nature. The time may have come latterly when the Democrats rather upheld State independence for the sake of slavery, than resisted assaults upon slavery for the sake of State independence. All we mean is that State rights, as distinct from Federal rights, form the essential doctrine of the Democrats, of which slavery is an unlucky accident; and that Federal rights,

as distinct from State rights, form the essential doctrine of the Whigs, of which abolition is also but an accident. The Southern States had, as it is well known, been feeling the yoke of the central government pinching them severely for some time previous to the secession. The two points at which they felt its weight most acutely were the questions of Free Trade and Slavery. And they had to determine which of them involved the worse evil. On the one hand, if they were less zealous on the Slave question, if they would have submitted to see the decision in the Dred Scott case set at nought by the Anti-slavery States, they would have saved the Democratic party from its recent split, and have ensured, perhaps within no long space of time, the repeal of the obnoxious tariff. But they decided that any concession on the Slavery question was the worst evil that could befall them, and by pushing as far as they did their demands for additional security, they lost the Democrats of the North, who, sympathising with them on all fundamental points, could not, however, bring themselves to a policy of "thorough" upon slavery; and it was their defection that secured the return of Mr. Lincoln.

The Democratic party is now, therefore, divided into two; a section of it siding with the North, though it cannot easily be supposed that there is much cordiality between the new allies. The Northern Democrats abjure the Whig or Federalist view of the Constitution; they are opposed to their commercial principles; and their only bond of union, except their dislike of slavery, may be a lingering desire to keep the old Republic together. But they cannot possibly be actuated by the sentiment most prevalent in the North, that the Southerners are audacious rebels whom the President must reduce to obedience in the interests of law and order. There is thus, in the Northern camp, a principle of division at work from which the Southerners are entirely exempt: and a principle more dangerous even in success than in adversity. For, supposing the North to triumph, it is impossible that the Whigs and Northern Democrats should agree upon the use to be made of their victory. The latter, unless false to all their traditions, could never sanction the extinction of local liberty in the Southern States. Yet, unless this local liberty were extinguished, the Southern States could never be governed by the North.

Such is the condition of the old American parties, Whigs and Democrats, at the present moment: Pro-slavery men and Anti-slavery men having always been and being still cross divisions of them. There is a third party which, previously to the outbreak of the civil war, was beginning to make its voice heard, though it is now probably silenced for ever, and that was the American party. The avowed object of this party was to secure all posts of influence to persons of American birth, and so to purify and refine the miscellaneous nationality, so to speak, which was the offspring of successive immigrations. But it will be a very long time before this party can raise its head again in the United States.

Other parties of whom we have heard so much in England, by a variety of quaint epithets, are not, in the proper sense of the word, political parties at

all. Hard-shells and Soft-shells denominated, as we have already pointed out, certain shades of difference on the Slavery question among the Democrats. Locofoco was a nickname given by the Whigs to their opponents, and Coon by the Democrats to the Whigs. Neither had a distinct meaning, both being rather examples of American humour than illustrations of American politics.

The Privy Councillor and the Liberation Society.

HE twenty-eighth page of the Report of the "Liberation Society" for the year 1860 displays the name of the Right Hon. T. Milner Gibson enrolled in the list of subscribers, as contributing 5*l.* in money—and, what is beyond all such vulgar considerations infinitely more important, the sanction not only of his name, but of his position as a Cabinet Minister and a Privy Councillor—to promote the objects of that Society. It is, therefore, not irrelevant to our purpose to consider its constitution and its principles.

In investigating the constitution and principles of our national government an inquirer naturally refers to those great epochs in history whence severally we date some remarkable precedents laid down, or some notable additions to the laws authoritatively made. In like manner, in order to investigate the constitution and principles of the "Liberation Society," we must also travel back into history. Our readers, however, need not be alarmed lest we should detain them among dusty records of very remote antiquity. It was *The Times*, we believe, which asserted, though we know not upon what foundation, that Mr. Bright was innocent of all history previous to the date 1832. We shall not have to dive into archives even so remote as that. The year 1844 will suffice for our purpose. So we will not transgress the limits of that field of observation which considerable authority has assigned even to the hon. member for Birmingham.

The "Liberation Society," to which the Right Hon. T. Milner Gibson has now contributed his money and the sanction of his name as a Cabinet Minister and Privy Councillor, was originally established in 1844, under the title of "The British Anti-State-Church Association." In 1853 it altered its title and assumed the name of "The Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control." It is now commonly known as "The Liberation Society;" and its constitution is, we believe, as follows:—

By congregations, by public meetings, and by the signatures of members subscribed to appointments, delegates unlimited in number are selected. These delegates compose a *Conference*. In 1844 the most distinguished of the delegates were J. S. Trelawney, Esq., M. P., the delegate from Tavistock. Dr. Bowring, M. P., doubly returned from Bolton and the Tower Hamlets, and W. S. Crawford, Esq., M. P., from London. The *Conference*, convened once in three years at least, appoints triennially a *Council*.

The *Council* was originally a body of 500 per-

sons:—300 for England, 100 for Scotland, 50 for Wales, and 50 for Ireland. But the number of the *Council* has more lately been increased to 600. The *Council* is directive, and meet once at least in twelve months. But its designs are carried out by a Committee.

This Committee is termed the *Executive Committee*. And appended to it is a *Parliamentary Committee*,—how composed is not altogether clear to the outer world. One thing, however, is clear enough, and it is this, that in the year 1861 its chairman was C. J. Foster, Esq., LL.D., a member of the Senate of the University of London. The *Executive Committee* is responsible for conducting the Society's general business, and for carrying into effect the resolutions of the triennial *Conference* and of the annual *Council*.

Thus the constitution of most modern associations is here reversed. Their committees originate measures for which the sanction of the whole body is obtained: here a committee is charged with carrying out the will of the more comprehensive parent.

Such is the constitution of this widely-spread Society. The principles upon which it is founded acquire considerable interest, among other reasons, from being sanctioned and supported by a Cabinet Minister and Privy Councillor, and next demand some attention. And here again, as before, we must have recourse to history. For its principles must be gathered from some authorized documents of time past, among which may be numbered, 1st, *Report of the British Anti-State-Church Association, for 1844*. 2nd, *Report of the Proceedings of the Society for 1860*.

In the first of those documents the Church of England is denounced as "specious," "pernicious," "worldly." And some of the principles of the Society, moreover, are enunciated with tolerable clearness in the following words:—"We do regard national establishments of religion as one of these imaginations of man, 'one of the high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God,' which require to be cast down. We do regard such establishments as one of Satan's strongholds, and among the strongest of the strong: the pulling down of which is the incumbent duty of every man who has a right conception of the spiritual character of Christ's kingdom, and who feels a becoming anxiety for its advancement and its glory." The bitterness of feeling expressed by the "Liberation Society" towards the Church of England in particular may further be gathered from the following passage in the Report of the Conference of the Society:—"After all the Church of England is a political structure, an ecclesiastical corporation based upon Acts of Parliament, and it will be through the medium of the legislature that it will be overthrown. The benumbing, deluding, destructive influence it exerts on Society, in its arrogant pretensions, as the representative of the Christian religion, may be more or less counteracted by the exertions and influence of Christian Societies. But for these, the Establishment would long before this have been developed in all its terrible proportions: and, indeed, the whole nation would at this hour have been prostrate at the feet of a ruthless and

besotted superstition. . . .” The Magna Charta of the “Liberation Society” furthermore sets forth some presumed blot on the English Constitution to the erasure of which the energies of the association are to be applied. Among such presumed blots, to many of which we shall not now advert, the following are specified:—1. “*The requirement of the profession of a particular faith by the monarch, and of a disclaimer by the possessors of certain high offices of articles of religious belief.*” 2. “*The religious sanctions to the solemn compact between the monarch and the nation at the ceremony of Coronation being administered exclusively by the ministers of a particular faith.*” And then the objects of the Society are set forth as involving, 1st, “*The repeal of all those laws which make the profession or disclaimer of any form of religious belief, or the subscribing of any declaration containing a pledge of a certain line of conduct towards any religious body, a necessary qualification for the exercise of any public office or employment;*” 2ndly, “*The enactment of laws for the entire abolition of public exactions in support of any form of religious faith, and for the resumption by Parliament (having regard to life interests of present possessors), and application to strictly national and purely secular purposes, of all lands, buildings, and other property, at any time given by the Crown, or by Parliament, for the sustentation of any form of religious worship, or for the exclusive use of bodies of men professing a specific form of religious belief.*”

Now, considering that among the laws and usages of our country above specified, as requiring repeal, we find, “*the requirement of a particular faith by the monarch;*” and also, “*the religious sanctions to the solemn compact between the monarch and the nation at the Coronation:*” and considering, moreover, that in the general summary of laws and usages which this Society seeks to abolish, we find no special exception in favour of those laws and usages which relate to the Crown; it is clear beyond all controversy that one object at least of this combination is to alter the constitution of our country as settled at the end of the seventeenth century, and to destroy the limitation of the succession of the Crown to Princes in communion with the Church of England, and professing the Faith of that Church. And in believing that this really is one of the objects of the “Liberation Society,” one is further warranted by the following expressions which occur in page 49 of the Report of 1844:—“*The Throne itself is not free, our Constitution associates it with the Church. The Throne is injured by the association. Maintained for the protection of the rights of all, it is bound and pinioned, and deprived of the free exercise of its power by an ecclesiastical Corporation, which, besides imposing upon the Sovereign an oath . . . exerts a most mischievously destructive influence upon the Crown.*”

Now, whether a combination of men to subvert the tenure by which the Throne of England is held be a conspiracy against the constitution, or whether the mere compassing of such an object be of itself constructive treason, and so, in either case, liable to legal penalties, upon this we do not now wish ourselves to express any opinion, though we are quite aware that on this subject a somewhat grave opinion has been expressed by considerable authority. But

we should much rejoice to hear that these questions were about to be raised in argument within the precincts of Westminster Hall, where we feel sure that no less subtlety and acuteness than learning and research would be applied to so interesting an inquiry. At any rate, whether such enterprises are legally punishable or not, it is beyond all question clear that a Cabinet Minister and Privy Councillor is not justified in according to them substantial help from his purse, and the more valuable sanction of his name. And it is, moreover, equally clear that in doing so he has betrayed singular forgetfulness, or negligence, of the oath to defend the succession of the Crown to the descendants of the Princess Sophia, with the constitutional qualification annexed.

Quite independently of the foregoing considerations, there is another point on which there appears to us to be a considerable discrepancy between the obligations of a Privy Councillor and the professed objects of a member of the “Liberation Society.” On the appointment of a Privy Councillor to his responsible office the sacramental test was formerly required. That qualification was, however, repealed, and a declaration in lieu of it was established by 9 Geo. IV. c. 17, and 2 Will. IV. c. 7. And now a person called to that high honour professes, “*upon the true faith of a Christian, that he will never exercise any power, or authority, or influence which he may possess by virtue of his office, to injure or weaken the Protestant Church, as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the bishops and clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such Church, or the said bishops and clergy are, or may be by law entitled.*” In contrast with the terms of the foregoing declaration, professed on the true faith of a Christian, it is observable that the third main object of the “Liberation Society,” as proclaimed, somewhat ostentatiously, in their *Circular*, now lying before us, and dated Nov. 1861, is, “*The application to secular uses (after an equitable satisfaction of existing interests), of all national property now held in trust by the United Church of England and Ireland.*”

Now, how this last-named object can be reconciled with the Right Hon. T. Milner Gibson's declaration as a Privy Councillor, solemnly made on the true faith of a Christian, we are utterly at a loss to imagine. We presume, however, that he must consider himself to be in a condition to explain away any apparent discrepancy. Whether, for such explanation, he would rely upon any rapping processes of Transatlantic mediums, or upon the new science of ideology, lately commended to notice, we cannot tell. At any rate, having ourselves had no satisfactory experience of either of those methods, we must be pardoned for expressing some curiosity as to the means by which such reconciliation (even if the profession of Christianity should for the moment be excepted from consideration) can be effected in the mind of an English gentleman, or, indeed, in any honest mind whatsoever.

Entertaining, however, grave doubts whether any satisfactory solution of the difficulty could be supplied by the chief actor in this woful exhibition,

we think that some light might be thrown upon the matter from another source. If, at the opening of the ensuing Parliament, some member of the House of Commons, who respects the integrity of official life, would ask the First Lord of the Treasury,—

1. Whether he was aware that a member of his Cabinet was also a member of the "Liberation Society?"
2. If so, whether he was satisfied that the members of the latter body were neither guilty of conspiracy nor of constructive treason? And
3. Whether he considered that a Privy Councillor's *solemn declaration on the faith of a Christian* was compatible with the third proclaimed object of the aforesaid Society? Then the country would either receive from the response some very interesting and valuable information; or, on the other hand, in case silence were persisted in, the country would surely learn this instructive lesson, viz. that some very dangerous political combinations are now secretly, to say the least, permitted in the present Cabinet, which its airy and vivacious chief could not be induced publicly to justify, or even to excuse.

Cathedral Music.

IT is not to be wondered at that the majority of our countrymen disparage the services celebrated in our cathedrals, when we consider how often they are performed in a slovenly and perfunctory manner. Nor can we wonder that musicians sometimes seem to look with contempt on cathedral music, when we remember how often it is badly selected and inefficiently performed. If our cathedrals really fulfilled their mission, they would be, as it were, "cities set on a hill;" they would set an example, in the matter of music, to their respective dioceses; and that not only of good compositions carefully performed by well-trained executants, but, what is far more important, of sacred song really made into an edifying devotional exercise, and solemnly dedicated to the glory of God. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this mission. England seems now to be aroused to a sense of the enormous value of good music in her Church, to the greatness of the advantages to be derived from the practice of praising God "with the best member that we have," and to the duty of adopting, therefore, every available means of improving the singing in all her parish churches. As evidences of this improved view of the matter, we have only to point to the various Diocesan Choral Associations which have arisen in different parts of the country. The music of our parochial churches is steadily and rapidly improving. But the same rapid improvement cannot be predicated of our cathedrals. This is the more remarkable inasmuch as very often the meetings of the Choral Associations have been held in cathedrals, and have achieved a great success, and yet the regular choir of the cathedral has not been stimulated to any efforts towards improvement, but rather the reverse. Let any one who has attended the late Festival Service of the Lichfield Choral Association compare with it an ordinary Sunday Service in the same cathedral of Lichfield, and we venture to predict that he will find our assertion thoroughly made out. In many cases choirs have been brought permanently together in various small and comparatively unknown churches, which habitually execute music of a calibre far surpassing anything ordinarily heard in the neighbouring cathedral, and not only so, but they execute it in a style and with a spirit which we look for in vain in the larger, older, and better-endowed choir. Now this is a crying shame and reproach, and our cathedral authorities ought to look to it.

Perhaps it may not be amiss, under these circumstances,

if we proceed to hint at a few of the causes which tend to the lamentable results to which we have alluded, and make one or two suggestions for their cure. In the first place, then, cathedral chorister-boys are often chosen out of the lowest of the people. Their style of singing and their pronunciation of the words are therefore vulgar and coarse, and they are for the most part incapable of that refinement of manner which alone can make music really edifying and pleasant to an educated ear; or, if by dint of great labour on the part of the organist or choir-master they are artificially imbued with an imitation of the proper style, it is almost sure to flow unnaturally and constrainedly, so as materially to damage the effect of their performance. The root of this evil lies in a false economy which denies to the choristers such a liberal education, board, and lodging, as shall induce respectable parents to desire to secure choristerships for their sons. It is true, indeed, that in many instances Deans and Chapters have begun to attend to this very important point, but still in most cases they have achieved their object very imperfectly, while in too many instances they have done absolutely nothing at all. It would be a painful thing to inquire in how many cathedrals the boys have no idea of their functions being a religious service. Alas! they sing but too often the most awful words without a glimmering of their meaning—without a thought of Him whom they are addressing with their lips, and all for want of spiritual supervision and guidance, such as the cathedral authorities are surely bound in conscience to provide for them. No wonder these poor lads grow up so often into careless, irreligious men, and through unchecked familiarity with holy things get to look upon all worship as little else but a solemn sham. Would that those whose carelessness and stinginess has wrought so dire a result would think a little more on the frightful spiritual murder of these young souls, which this wretched system involves! But in the next place, the adult lay-members of our cathedral choirs are very often far below the proper mark. Ill-paid, and too much neglected in some places; over-endowed, and therefore too independent and unmanageable in others: they are in either case totally unfit for the peculiar work they have to do. Provincialisms, vulgarity, and false taste, frequently united with the most offensive conceits and stubborn untractableness, too often are met with among these men, and would that this were all; we know of too many instances of drunkenness and other immorality prevailing unchecked and unnoticed, to the scandal of all good Christians, and to the lasting disgrace of the authorities, who through indolence or negligence ignore these things.

Now it is evident that this sad result partly springs from the bad training which these men had when they were chorister-boys; but it is also attributable to insufficient pay, which sometimes induces them to sing the most objectionable music in public-houses, or even in questionable places of entertainment, or else forces them to adopt various trades to gain a livelihood, not always the most respectable. Of course these remarks do not apply to well-paid choirs, such as those in the metropolis and some of our best cathedrals. Moreover, it is certain that a vast improvement has taken place of late years in this particular; still a sufficient number of bad cases remain amply to justify what has here been said. Among the very *élite* of our cathedral choirmen there are those who sing rather for their own glory than for God's glory, and get into a bad way of looking on the service from a purely musical, or rather professional, point of view, forgetting in a great measure the end and object of all that they have to do. As a proof of this assertion we need only remark that, with two, or at the most three, exceptions, cathedral choirs would seem to be destitute of habitual lay-communicants among their members; and this, even in the rare cases when the Communion Office is chorally celebrated throughout. Now surely this is a gigantic evil. When we reflect on the bad example thus set to the boys of the choir by their elder brethren, we cannot shut our eyes to its magnitude. Moreover it is notorious that grave exception is continually taken to our Cathedral Service

generally, on account of the irreverent manner displayed by the members of the choir, and that thus one of the Church's most valuable institutions is brought into disrepute. It is very sad to be obliged to say that the charge of irreverence has to be extended, not unfrequently, to members of the Cathedral body who are not lay. If the priest does not "keep his foot when he goeth into the House of God," who shall wonder that those who are not priests do likewise! It is no answer to these observations to point to instances where they do not apply. Even if three-fourths of our Cathedral bodies throughout the country were free from these errors and drawbacks, it would be a grievous scandal if they were allowed to go unproved and unchecked in the remaining fourth. How then, it may be asked, can an improvement be wrought out? In various ways. First, let the Deans and Chapters seek out regular and steady communicants to be members of their choir; let them pay these men a sufficient stipend to render them in a measure independent of extraneous means of getting a livelihood. Above all, let them look after not only their bodily but their spiritual wants. Let them visit them when sick, advise them when troubled with doubts, console them when afflicted, and, in short, become really their friends and spiritual pastors. By these means much good might be done. Especially, too, let all irreverence and frivolity of manner in Divine Service be at once checked by the hand of authority; and let nothing be countenanced which could tend to engender these evils—such, for instance, as the practice prevalent in London, Dublin, Cambridge, and elsewhere, of allowing the same men to belong to several different choirs, and go from one to the other to sing the same words over and over again, often having to leave the first service for the sake of the second, before the former is finished. If such bad practices were put a stop to, as they easily might be, it is probable that a great increase of reality and earnestness in the performance of the service would ensue.

But it is time to say a few words on a particularly musical part of the subject. English Cathedral music, of the best school, requires not only good solo-singers, but a good chorus—a good body of voices. Many cathedral choirs only consist of eight or ten boys, and six men—that is, one to a part on each side—and of these six men only three attend on ordinary week days. No wonder flimsy solos and duets take the place of good solid choruses, when such inadequate numbers are to be the performers. *Twelve men daily* is the very least number that can really do justice to the highest style of music. We say *daily*, because such music never can be well done except by a body of voices accustomed to sing constantly together. But such large choirs cost money; hence their rarity. We are driven at length to the conclusion that after all the root of this evil, as of other evils under the sun, is an indisposition to spend money; the whole matter, in many ways, at last resolves itself into a question of parsimony *versus* liberality. Is there any chance just now of wiping away this reproach? Let us hope so.

Irish Revivalism.



MORE than three years have now elapsed since Revivalism first developed itself in the North of Ireland. Time, therefore, has been given it to bring forth its due fruit, and we may now fairly claim to test the whole movement by its results. We shall perhaps best do this by considering the manner in which it first developed itself, the means used for its propagation, and the effects then produced on those who were subjected to its influence.

The religious habits of the Presbyterians of Ulster are especially favourable to the introduction and furtherance of such a system. Extempore prayer and preaching form the staple of the religion of that province. Congregations are clustered round individual ministers, and on

their popularity much of their stipend depends. Should any of them displease a member of his congregation, he quickly transfers himself to another and more acceptable preacher. This interchange is continually going forward, and it inevitably follows that if the minister wishes to live he must conduct his ministrations in accordance with the popular will. He cannot withstand it; were he to attempt to do so his meeting-house would quickly be emptied, and he would thus be deprived of the means of existence.

The truth of this was remarkably shown at the beginning of the Revival. Presbyterian ministers who were at first opposed to its extravagancies, and unwilling to lend their influence to its support, were obliged by the power of public opinion to become leaders in the movement and exponents of the popular will.

We cannot wonder, then, that in such a soil the baneful plant of Revivalism rapidly grew and flourished. Everything was favourable to its development. Where religion consists principally in the excitement of popular preaching the people are ever ready to hear and receive "some new thing." No sooner, therefore, was it reported that in the neighbourhood of Ballymore persons who had hitherto led careless, godless lives had been suddenly converted, and that the conversion was manifested in outward and bodily acts, and that the converted had at once found "joy and peace in believing," than the excitement became general, and the greatest anxiety was manifested to witness this miraculous change, and to partake in the blessings it was supposed to confer.

The public mind being thus prepared for its reception, the movement spread with wondrous rapidity. Each new convert was at once exalted into a saint. He was forthwith deemed fully qualified by his conversion to preach, exhort, and convince the gainsayers. When "the Revival" was to be introduced to any new town or district it was by means of converts such as these that the work was accomplished. If the ministers of religion approved they were associated with them in it, but if not, their consent was deemed unnecessary, and it was carried on without them. Revival began with "success." Revival converts, with vehement voice and animated gesture, thundered forth their experience, frequently denouncing all who had not, like themselves, received the physical seizure as doomed to eternal destruction. The effect thus produced on the ignorant and simple-minded can hardly be appreciated except by those who are fully acquainted with the class in question. They were told and believed—believed with all their hearts—that their salvation depended on their "getting the Revival" or being "struck." Night and day, with unabated energy and fervor, they prayed that this mark of the Divine favour might be bestowed upon them. They wandered from meeting-house to meeting-house, from prayer-meeting to prayer-meeting, till they caught the prevailing influences and were "struck." Then all was well. They were numbered amongst the saved. Their salvation was certain. Their reward secured. From sinners they had passed once and for ever into the ranks of God's elect. The Spirit had visibly marked them as His own, and what was man that he should gainsay that which God had wrought?

This fearful delusion, instead of being repressed, was encouraged by those whose duty it was to expose it. In a pamphlet, published shortly after the Revival began, by a Presbyterian minister, and addressed by him to his hearers, the bodily manifestations are there referred to; the language and grammar of the original are given *verbatim*:—"These results, in the first instance at least, from the sudden and novel operation of the Spirit upon the soul, whereby the conscience of the quickened is made afraid by the remembrance of past sins, and from the devil being thus aroused to assault them with great violence, overwhelming them by their 'convictions,' as their feelings are more generally termed. Hence the choking sensation, the heavy burden upon the heart swelling in distress, sometimes convulsing the whole frame and making every joint tremble so as to produce bodily weakness and pros-

tration. This prostration is always accompanied, if not partly occasioned, by a vehement desire to pray: for, when the perspiration streams from the person, and the body shakes like an aspen leaf, the hands are generally clasped with convulsive energy and raised aloft to heaven, showing that the soul, in terrible misery, is agonising prayerfully for pardon and peace from the Saviour God. . . . A few of these cases have assumed a trance-like or ecstatic form, accompanied for a time, often so definite as to be determined precisely by the persons under its influence, and varying from one day to seven, by dumbness, deafness, or blindness, a kind of spiritual somnambulism and clairvoyance. . . . These are external accompaniments which the Lord permits, and which He doubtless uses in some way to promote His own glory; and even when they result *physically in disease* (the italics are not our own) we should recognize their divine origin."

Can we wonder that under leaders such as these the wildest extravagancies of fanaticism were developed as the movement went on?

By these means a most erroneous, but powerfully operative, public opinion was created and strengthened and supported. The Revival grew apace. Meanwhile there was rapidly growing up amongst the multitude a dislike and even repudiation of authorized ministrations. Sacraments and means of grace were esteemed of little worth by men who deemed their every action directed by the Spirit of God. Revivalist teachers pointed with complacency to the fact that their commission to teach was directly from God, and that ordained ministers had nothing to do with the success of the movement. Armed with this self-imposed authority, the saved sinner at once presented himself to the public, not only to announce his own deliverance, but also to urge the necessity of a similar physical change on all whom he addressed. It mattered not whether their previous lives had been moral or immoral, self-denying or sensual, it was boldly declared that this physical change they must experience if they would be saved. Once possessed of it, they were taught that their bodily condition was the direct and visible sign of the Holy Spirit having worked salvation in the soul.

Archdeacon Stopford in his admirable pamphlet, *The Work and the Counterwork*, has clearly shown that these physical effects were produced by some natural agency akin in its phenomena to hysteria, and this opinion is borne out by the remarks of Dr. Carson, of Coleraine, himself a strenuous advocate of the Revival, who has observed—"that the most illiterate convert who had himself been affected had far more power in producing the manifestation in the audience than the most eloquent and touching speaker. There did not seem to be any proportion between the words uttered by the speaker and the results produced."

By means such as these the Revival was rapidly propagated from town to town and village to village throughout the greater part of the Presbyterian districts of Ulster. Prayer-meetings prolonged, in many cases, to a late hour of the night, (one, for example, at Monreagh, at which a hundred persons were "struck," lasted till three o'clock in the morning), were held in almost every cottage. Those who had been present at them returned home together singing revival hymns as they proceeded—a custom which before long produced the worst results. For a time great good seemed to have been effected; the attendance at public worship was largely increased, and Presbyterians did not fail with all authority to declare that the success of the Revival amongst them was a direct proof from God of *the truth of Presbyterianism*.

The words of Dr. Gibson, the headmaster of the Presbyterian General Assembly in Ireland, on this subject, are worthy of especial remark. In a sermon preached before the assembly on July 2, 1860, on the occasion of resigning his moderatorship, he said: "The present Revival was a conversion of sinners, and if they wanted a proof of the truth of the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church, they had it in the Revival. Upon whom had God showered down His blessings? upon the Presbyterian Church. It was her pastures He had watered,

and made green and flourishing. Some wished to represent that the Revival was breaking down distinction of creeds, inasmuch as they said that God was pouring out His Spirit on all Churches alike. *Such was wholly incorrect.* God had blessed the Presbyterian Church; thus giving a proof that in her Jehovah took delight. The Presbyterian Church did not substitute, for the supremacy of Christ, succession and confirmation and other forms and rituals of man's invention, but took His own Holy Word as their standard; and God had given them and the world in the Revival a proof of the truth of Presbyterianism."

The Revival was thus justly claimed by the Presbyterians as their own. The truth of their doctrine and polity was staked by these moderators upon it, and they cannot blame a discriminating public if they conclude from the evil results of the Revival that neither the Presbyterian doctrine or polity is of God.

It was not to be expected that such a disturbing movement could arise without producing a considerable effect upon the Church. Yet the impression thus created was far less than is usually supposed. Some few clergy unhappily there were, who, during the Revival, joined in union prayer-meetings with dissenting ministers, and took part in public demonstrations with them, but many of those who thus acted, have since seen good reason to repent having done so. The great body of the clergy, however, applied themselves earnestly to take advantage of the anxiety that was manifested for religious instruction, which is the one and only good point of the Revival, and multiplied the services and ministrations of the Church, and the result was an increased attendance both at Divine Service and Holy Communion. But, notwithstanding the earnest endeavours of its promoters, revivalism took no root within the fold of the Church. In its calm and sober worship, in its discouragement of all excitement in religion, in its emphatic declaration of the necessity of a rightly authorized commission to the due exercise of the ministerial office, Revivalism found no hold, and having vainly but pertinaciously endeavoured to obtain a lodgment within the bosom of the Church, it retreated to a more welcome and congenial home amongst the sectaries which summoned it.

It can never perhaps be asserted with truth that any earnest religious movement, from whatever quarter it proceeds, is an unmixed evil. However greatly the bad results may predominate over the good, there is generally some good effected by its instrumentality, if not directly, at least indirectly. So was it with the Revival. So is it with any signal visitation of God, such as cholera, or any prevalent disease. The careless are for the time awakened, the negligent aroused to think of the future, and, if due impression be made whilst their hearts are softened, permanent results may follow. But in the case of the Revival the evil results far outweigh the apparent good. An outward reformation of morals for a time ensued, but sooner than the summer cloud it has passed away, and left behind it a reaction which has already produced the bitterest fruits. Let us hear on this point the testimony of Mr. Isaac Nelson, a Presbyterian minister in Belfast, and the only one we believe who has had the boldness publicly to resist the popular will. "The Revival," says he, in *The Year of Delusion*, written in answer to Dr. Gibson's *Year of Grace*, "was made to rest for its reality on certain extraordinary conversions which have since proved false and wicked—the consequence being an immensely increased immorality over Ulster. Now, will Dr. McCorle meet us on this assertion, or put it to the test of statistics? We know he will not; he dare not. The morality of the Presbyterian people has been ruined by Revival."

Such is the result of the Revival on Presbyterianism, one of their own number being the judge. Yet this is not the only way in which the religion of the provinces can suffer from the Revival. It has shaken to the foundation the belief of many in the necessity of sacraments and authorized ministrations, and of this feeling the Baptists and Plymouth Brethren have not failed largely and effectually to avail themselves. They have gathered in a rich harvest

from amongst the Revivalists. Take one case as an example. A Presbyterian minister, of much influence in the neighbourhood where the Revival first began, has by it been transformed into an active and energetic Baptist preacher, and his tongue and his pen are now incessantly employed in attacking the peculiarities of his former co-religionists, and so successful has he been, that he has gathered together a Baptist congregation, and built a Baptist meeting-house in a town where neither existed before. Many of the earlier Revivalists, whose mental calibre could not withstand the excitement of the movement, have found a permanent home in lunatic asylums; whilst multitudes of others, puffed up with spiritual pride, have fallen into worse diseases than that of the mind. Many who three years ago were distinguished as Revivalist preachers of the purest and most sanctified kind are now drunkards, thieves, and immoral livers; and one, to our certain knowledge, is now lying in prison, charged with being concerned in a late cowardly and barbarous murder. Since the Revival began seduction has prevailed to an extent never known before, as the large increase in the number of illegitimate children so fully proves; by it the sectarian spirit of the Presbyterians has been embittered and intensified, as their eager union with their dissenting brethren in England, in celebrating the Bicentenary of 1662 by an order of the General Assembly, has so lately shown. Has party spirit been diminished by it? Let Derrymacash and the monster Protestant meeting of September 17th and its consequent results reply. Has drunkenness or immorality decreased in the district where it chiefly prevailed? The very contrary is the fact. Judged therefore by its results the Revival movement of 1859-60 must be considered not as "a refreshing stream of God's grace," as some have not hesitated profanely to call it, but as a withering blight which has parched the ground which it seemed to refresh, and has left behind it fruits the full bitterness of which will never be truly known till the day of doom.

Intellectual Moonshine.

EW systems," says Sir E. B. Lytton, in last month's *Blackwood*, "will replace for a time even those of the *Novum Organum* and *Principia*. But two thousand years after that victory, the *Novum Organum* and *Principia* will again be re-aired and well dusted, and set up in the schools as the only sound system; they will then be called novelties, 'approximating towards perfection.'" Every one who has scanned the march of philosophy will acquiesce in the justice of this statement—so humbling, yet so true. Nature seems to advance, like the typhoon, in cycloids—the old principles ever re-appearing, but under different circumstances; but mental science proceeds simply in circles. One system gives place to another, only in due time to re-appear. Libraries have been written upon philosophy, and yet—by one who could give a lifetime to the subject—a single volume of moderate size could be made to set forth the substance of all that has been written: so many of these writings are mere revivals or repetitions, or elaborate disquisitions upon differences which, if not wholly phantasmagorical, could at least be expressed in half-a-dozen lines.

As few men are conversant with the old schools of philosophy, or with any schools but those in fashion in our own country, we need not be surprised to find that the present age is as indiscriminating as its predecessors. Ignorance is the parent of novelty. The systems which seem new in mental science to our English world now-a-days, are nothing better than very old ones "re-aired and well dusted," and invested with the appropriate apparel of the age. A hundred years ago, Hume, Condillac, and Helvetius were the great exponents, of *their* times, of the creeds of Scepticism and Materialism—creeds often confounded, but widely distinct. Excepting his arguments against the genuineness of the miracles of the Bible—

arguments utterly antiquated now by the advance of psychological knowledge—the writings of Hume are to be regarded simply as efforts to show that human knowledge is a much more uncertain and limited thing than ordinary people believe. Hume did not set up a system: he criticised. In fact, his writings are, in spirit, entirely opposed to the elaboration of philosophical systems, and are directed to the limitation of beliefs. Helvetius, on the other hand, was a system-maker *par excellence*. His *Système de la Nature* is one of the most elaborate and beautifully-written expositions of Materialism ever penned. Life, soul, thought, passions, are all, according to him, results of our bodily organization and circumstances. Doubtless, it would have been humbling to him and to the other materialistic philosophers of his age and country to know that seven centuries before their time the same creed had been not only worked out, but was the fashion in China under the learned dynasty of Soong!

The French Revolution of 1789 is said by its admirers to have inaugurated a new epoch; to have been the commencement of a new world. It at least made an end of an old one. It buried the infidel school of the Encyclopedists, from which it sprung. In our own country, as well as in France, the nineteenth century saw a new spirit arise both in religion and in literary speculation. For the last fifty years heterodox speculation has been almost in abeyance: men did not speculate much at all, and when they did speculate they kept very near to the orthodox track. But within the last year or two we have been witnessing the commencement of another circle of thought. Mr. Buckle has expounded with great ability his views of history, endeavouring to prove that there is really no Free-will, but only Necessity, in those actions and characteristics of nations which make up their history. Mr. Bain, on the other hand, and those others who belong to the school of what is called the Association Psychology, while rejoicing in speculation still more heterodox, prides himself on having discovered a system which reduces Free-will and Necessity to meaningless terms, and denies altogether that there is any such thing as Conscience.

This Association Psychology is really a very old affair. We willingly admit that Mr. Bain has brought to his task an admirable knowledge of modern science, and that his work is one of unquestionable ability. But, we repeat, it is a very old question in a new garb; and, whatever may be the value of the work in its details, it seems to us that, so far as regards the principles which it seeks to establish, the labour in its composition has been thrown away. A definition of terms is the first duty of a mental philosopher, and a clear conception and remembrance of this definition is indispensable in the reader. Now, when we hear, as a very momentous affair, that a system of so-called philosophy denies the reality of conscience and of abstract truth, we reply—"Very likely; but what is the denial worth? Or rather, *what is it* that is denied?" It is all very well for schoolboys to write themes about "absolute truth;" but every one who is versed in mental science knows that absolute truth, in the sense ascribed to the words by metaphysicians, is a chimera—*vox et præterea nihil*. Tell this to an ordinary person, however, and he will be dreadfully shocked, and will think you worse than an infidel. Why? Simply because he has never thought of the subject, and vaguely attributes to "absolute truth" a meaning entirely different from that held by the metaphysicians, and which if they did hold they would never question the reality of the thing signified. The metaphysician denies one thing, the bulk of mankind believes he denies something entirely different. And, misled by the importance which ordinary people attach to his doctrine, the metaphysician in turn deludes himself with the idea that he has propounded something very important. And yet the whole affair is—as commonly happens in metaphysical questions—mere moonshine.

Take, for example, Mr. Bain's denial that there is really such a thing as conscience. Good people, when they hear of such a denial, naturally turn up the whites of

their eyes, and consider Mr. Bain as a very bad character. But the great mass of mankind will hear of it, and go on with their habits and beliefs just as before. Practically, they will treat it as a matter of no moment; and, theoretically, we venture to think they would be no less entitled to do the same. This "association" theory is one of which the present and past generation heard a good deal forty years ago. Lord Jeffrey treated beauty just as Mr. Bain now treats truth. There was a portion of truth in his lordship's theory, just as there is, to a smaller extent, in Mr. Bain's. In morals, as in æsthetics, the power of association is undeniable—and no one thinks of denying it. What was peculiar in Jeffrey's theory is that he makes all beauty, as Bain does all virtue, a perfectly arbitrary thing, dependent *entirely* upon association of ideas. Jeffrey denied that there was an æsthetic faculty, just as Bain denies that there is such a thing as conscience, or moral faculty. A glorious piece of moonshine. Ask Lord Jeffrey, "Do not men take cognizance of beauty?" and his lordship would have answered, "Yes, of course they do." Ask Mr. Bain, "Do men not judge of right and wrong?" and he must equally answer in the affirmative. What more do we want? What matter whether you call it a faculty or not—a conscience or not? We judge of beauty and ugliness, of virtue and vice,—Bain and Jeffrey admit, and of course must admit, that we do so; what they deny is what few persons question, what still fewer care about, and what is of no practical importance to any one.

Morals and manners vary in different countries. What is reckoned a vice in one country is regarded as a virtue, or is tolerated as legitimate, in another. But from that to deny that man has a moral sense is absurd. One might as well deny that there is a colouring matter in the human hair because it is black in one nation, and white, red, or brown in others. Accordingly, when Mr. Bain affirms that there is no such thing as truth, and no such faculty as conscience, all that, on his own premises, he is entitled to say is, that men's sense of right and wrong varies to a great extent all over the world. And who doubts it?

How our sense of right and wrong arises, and how it operates, is a different question. Mr. Bain maintains that it is simply an affair of education and habit. Conscience, he says, is a mere "imitation within ourselves of the government without us." This is not an explanation; it is simply removing the difficulty a stage further. For, admitting, for argument's sake, that in general terms we might define conscience as "an imitation of the government without us," how does that "government without us" itself arise? Is it not directly the product of the conscience of the whole community? Unquestionably it is. Since, then, we have thus a conscience in individuals, and a conscience in entire communities, we think that any one of a timid mind who has been frightened by Mr. Bain's denial that there is any such thing as conscience, may very comfortably go to sleep in the assurance that, after all, "there is no harm done"—except to those who cannot discriminate between words and things.

Even though Mr. Bain's system be substantially a materialistic one, there is extremely little body in it. In some of the reviews of his work we have been amused to see the grandiose airs of impartiality assumed by men who evidently were incapable of judging at all. Orthodox theologians and critics are invited, in terms which insinuate their great unwillingness to do so, to meet Mr. Bain's system and heresies fairly; but we should like to know what there is to meet. Even were we to accept all his facts and arguments—which is much more than we can honestly do—we should come to the ordinary belief after all, and establish the reality of that moral sense which he is desirous to explain away.

However substantial Mr. Bain's book* may be in its details, its conclusions are eminently vapoury. For example, he thinks his system sweeps away such terms as Necessity and Free-will; whereas, to any ordinary intellect, his meaning just leaves the matter as it was, and as it is

* *The Emotions and the Will*. Parker, Son, and Bourn.

ever likely to be. He thinks it a discovery to say that man acts from motive, and motive alone. A mighty discovery truly—who doubts it? And then he maintains that the only thing which determines man's motives is this influence of association, which he exalts as the *primum mobile* of human nature. But this is plainly inadequate. Two men, though similarly trained, if placed in similar circumstances, will act differently. There are diversities of mind and body which exist previous to any association—which descend to us from our parents and grand-parents to the third and fourth generation. Organization and circumstance, then, determine the motive—not circumstance (or association) alone. Now, we have yet to learn that man can order for himself all the circumstances (or associations) of his life; and most assuredly he cannot choose for himself the organization which he receives at his birth. Here, then, is necessity again. And the opposite doctrine of free-will is just as little swept away. Mr. Bain's discovery (!) that man acts from motive does not help us one jot. Our wonder is how any man of sense could ever imagine that it had any such potency.

One bit of moonshine more, and we have done. It is another "discovery." Mr. Bain makes the announcement that, in the process of analysis which he adopts, man's very "self" disappears. When emotion, volition, and intellect have been thoroughly examined, and their phenomena taken away, Mr. Bain finds no residuum which answers to this term, and, indeed, no residuum whatever. Very truly: but what did he expect to find? This "discovery," of course, is regarded as throwing doubt upon the immortality of the soul—or, rather, on the existence of any such thing as soul at all. Yet it is utterly impotent to justify any such deduction, and the whole "discovery" is one of the weakest crotchets that ever entered into the brain, one of the silliest wind-bags that ever deluded the eye, even of a metaphysician. What does it amount to? Take everything from anything, and nothing remains. Is that new? Did any man out of Bedlam ever doubt it? Or does any one who is not bound for that asylum attach to it the importance, or deduce from it the inferences, which are attributed to it by the "Association Psychologists?"

Statute-fairs.

N most English counties, though not in all, certain fairs are held, not for the buying of cattle, but for the hiring of servants, who, with rare exceptions, are farm-servants. These fairs are variously known by the names of Statutes, Hirings, and Mops. A little more than a century since, the last word was written "Mapp," which was but another form for "Mop," a useful household article which is correctly traced by Johnson to *mappa*, the *sudarium*, or handkerchief with which a person now "mops" his heated face, and which was formerly dropped by the Roman Emperors as the signal for the commencement of the *ludi circenses*, hence termed *Mappa*. Thus, the vulgar term "Mop" for a Statute-fair may, after all, be derived from the public games of the ancient Romans; while the Statutes themselves certainly date back as far as the reign of Edward III, when legislative enactments were passed for the regulation of servants' wages. Hence, Statute-fairs—at any rate, in the generality of cases—have an older origin than was attributed to them a few years since by the Rev. Nash Stephenson, in his paper on the subject read before the Liverpool meeting of the Social Science Association, wherein he assigned their rise to enterprising landlords who got them up for their own benefit. It is true, that publicans, as a matter of business, are among the foremost supporters of these Statutes; but they were among the old institutions and customs of the country, and, as such, are depicted by Isaac Bickerstaffe in his *Love in a Village*. Lady-day, May, and Michaelmas, are the seasons for these Statutes; but, as in the case of the "May Hirings,"

the Michaelmas Statutes are protracted through the month of October, and are not only held over Old Michaelmas Day, but even to the 29th of October, which was the day for the Henley-in-Arden Statute. The times for the various Statutes in any district are so arranged that they may not interfere with each other. We have been looking through many provincial newspapers for the past month, and we find that though the Mops and Statutes are, in certain places, somewhat on the wane, so that (to quote one of the newspaper accounts) "there were fewer shows and booths, and little doing besides the usual drinking and rough-and-tumble dancing,"—yet, that in other spots, the Statutes showed no falling off in the attendance, or in the attractions provided. It is with the hope of doing something towards the abolition of these Statute-fairs, as now conducted, that we direct attention to the subject. They exist ostensibly for the hiring of farm-servants (and, occasionally, domestic servants); they continue, in reality, for the demoralization of those who attend them. The ordinary laws of demand and supply are presumed, in this instance, to be incompatible with the arrangements that usually obtain between the employer and employed; and, if a farmer needs a new workman, the supposed necessity of the case compels him to wait until the next Statute, before he can hire one,—an absurd and arbitrary custom, which is so widely spread in certain districts that it even affects the engagement of domestic servants in private families, for they, like the farm labourers, will hire themselves only by the year, at the end of which they expect, and demand, the customary "Mop" holiday, even when retaining their "places." And we have known cases where, when the Mop is held on a stated day, and that day has fallen on a Sunday, the two days have been claimed for the servants' holiday.

When, with the intention of engaging a carter or dairy-maid, the farmer arrives at the town, or hundred, where the Statute is held, he finds there an assembly of men and women, waiting to be hired—in Scriptural fashion, as Dr. Plot would have it, who referred the origin of the custom to Matthew xx. 3—but rather, as it seems to us, *more Americano*; and yet, by the excessive freedom of their manners, evidently proclaiming themselves to be Britons that never, never will be slaves. The farmer looks around upon the carters, ploughmen, and shepherds—who sometimes denote their business by tufts of wool and pieces of whipcord stuck in their hats—and makes his selection from the throng, much in the same way that he would buy his cattle—though, with this drawback in the case of the human stock, that the labourer whom he selects, and to whom he gives the "hiring money" or "fasten-penny," may play him false, and may trick some half-a-dozen farmers in the same way; or, if he really engages himself, may do so only for the sake of a winter-home, and may, when Lady-day arrives, surreptitiously betake himself to a distant Statute, and hire himself over again to a new employer, who, as he well knows, from Statute experience, will not ask any questions as to character, but will only look to thews and sinews and the outward evidences of a capacity for work. In such a case, the employer can do but little—unless it be to take warning from his past experience; and, as he is probably altogether ignorant of the man's antecedents, he knows not where to look for him; and, to send a policeman after him, would be perfectly useless. In one case during the past month the farmer refused to allow his waggoner to go to the Statute. The man took french leave and went, but returned at night; whereupon his master summonsed him for absconding from his service; and the man was fined 8s. and expenses. Perhaps no express stipulation had been made in this instance between master and man; and the law would appear to be on the side of the former: but custom certainly is in favour of the servant, and the customary rule of allowing farm-servants to attend the Statutes is very generally observed.

Thus, the majority of those who frequent the Statutes are those who are neither in a position to hire nor to be hired. It is manifest, therefore, that their presence is extraneous

to the professed object of the assembly. But, even were they actual partakers in the hiring, the mere business of the meeting is transacted before noon. Yet the Statute-fair not only lasts till the evening, but does not reach its height till then; and is prolonged through the night. For what? obviously for purposes altogether apart from its professed object. Indeed, its main business is at once indicated by the leading aspects of the scene. The place where the Statute is held is thronged with shows, booths, stalls, photographic establishments, shooting-galleries, dancing tents, merry-go-rounds, and the usual paraphernalia of a country fair. The public-houses are open, and thronged day and night, and drive a roaring trade. Dancing is commenced at an early hour in the afternoon, and is kept up with uproarious energy till an early hour the next morning. Drunkenness and bemuddledom commence at a still earlier hour, and are maintained to a still later. All the foulness, profanity, and obscene and filthy jesting that can be evolved from the scum of the community is there seething, as in an evil cauldron. Ribaldry and debauchery are let loose for a season; and, into the excitement of their contaminations, young girls and lads from all the surrounding villages are recklessly plunged, and, in twelve hours, can undo the work of as many years, and horribly injure, if not irretrievably destroy, those early impressions of piety and goodness which they have learnt at school and at church, and, perhaps, at home. We speak not from imagination, but describe what we have seen with our eyes, and heard with our ears, over and over again. What said a tenant-farmer (whom we personally knew, and on whose word we can place full reliance) at the Worcester meeting for the suppression of Mops, Nov. 12, 1859? This was his testimony:—

"He spoke practically of his experience of Mops, having seen one a few weeks ago, where the servants in the evening resorted to beer-shops; but he saw them all emerging simultaneously on hearing four fellows in the street commence the singing of obscene songs. Boys and girls all trooped together to hear this; and it would seem that the real purpose of Mops was not so much for hiring as for indulgence in some of the most debased passions of human kind."

Another tenant-farmer, at the same meeting, after speaking of "the degrading effects of Mops in exposing young girls like cattle in the streets," asked:—

"How could females be expected to turn out well who commenced their earliest public life in such a manner and amid such scenes as were afforded by Mops, where drunkenness, ribald jests, and debauchery of all kinds prevailed? As to the holiday, the time for holding Mops was the very worst season that could be thought of for a holiday; and as the labourers took with them the bulk of their wages just received, it too often happened that the whole, or a greater portion was spent in drunkenness, and in ruining the character of both sexes. So horrible were the scenes which took place at night, that he had known many persons, living in the neighbourhood of Mops, quit their houses till the following day."

At the same meeting, Sir John Pakington said that he "believed these meetings, or Statutes, without answering the good purpose for which they professed to be held, led practically to very considerable evils and mischief," and "had a very demoralizing and bad tendency." More than one county-magistrate confirmed these statements from their own judicial and personal experience; and Lord Lyttelton, the chairman of the meeting, who spoke with his usual ability and sound sense, said that he "had no doubt whatever, from all he had seen and heard, that the evil attending Statute-fairs was a serious one, and well worthy the attention of gentlemen and farmers of the county to attempt to put an end to. That Statute-fairs were attended with great evil was altogether beyond argument, and the only question was whether it was a necessary and irremediable evil, or whether there were benefits that counterbalanced the evils so occasioned." He plainly showed that there were not; and he observed, that "there must always, of course, be serious evils attendant upon

large promiscuous assemblages of human beings of both sexes, mainly constituted of young persons; and more particularly must that be so with regard to Statute-fairs, because there the young people generally attended by themselves, without their parents and guardians, and there was no superintendence over them."

If space permitted we might adduce cumulative testimony to the same effect. There are, of course, some Statute-fairs that are not so outrageously bad as others, just as there are variations in the attendance upon each dependent upon the populousness of the district where it is held; still, for that district, it is an evil that is not mitigated by the slight and very questionable benefit that it affords to the employer of labour. It would be invidious to mention names when all are more or less bad; or we could, from our own personal experience, point to the evils occasioned by Statute-fairs in more than one county-town, and also in towns within a railway-sixpence of Birmingham or Wolverhampton, where the congregation of individuals and the consequent certainty of drunken orgies and libidinous revels is, of course, far greater than in those Mops in purely agricultural districts, of which we have also had some years' experience. Imagine a young and simple country girl at one of these Statutes! excited by hours of unwonted dancing, ale, and gin, she is led towards her home by one of the newly-made acquaintance, whose sense of honour (if he ever had any) has long since been Mopp'd out of him: the darkness, or dim light of early morning is convenient, and the lane or field is lonely; and what wonder that purity should be lost, after hours spent in the atmosphere of impurity?

It is on social and moral grounds, then, that we call on clergy and laity to aid in the abolition of Mops and Statute-fairs. The object for which they are supposed to exist can be far better attained by a less inconvenient and more rational system; and the day's holiday which they give to the agricultural labourer can be better employed by some substitute that shall neither pauperise him nor demoralize his daughters. But, into this part of the question we will not enter, more especially as we have so recently indicated a healthy day's holiday in our paper on parochial Harvest-homes. Nor will we answer the remarks of certain who say, "The doings at a Mop are no worse, in their way, than the doings at a horse-race; the gentry have their balls and assemblies, why should not the labourers have theirs?" All we would now say on this point is, we do not desire to deprive one class of that which we would allow to another; but we do desire to eliminate evil from any assembly, whether of rich or poor; and with regard to the particular subject of horse-racing, we, only last month, directed attention to the evils arising from betting. Our objection to a Statute-fair is based not upon the assumption that it is the poor man's holiday, as the cuckoo-cry of some would call it; but on the far wider and surer ground, that it is not only the aider and abettor, but the teacher and author, of vice; and, as such, we would suppress it. The Worcestershire Servants' Registration Society (founded at the meeting to which we have already alluded) set about the work by establishing, in county-towns and other convenient places, registration offices, where farmers and employers of labour could at any time apply for servants. It must be confessed, however, that neither the Worcestershire society, nor the similar society established in Northamptonshire, has met with a success proportionate to its deserts or the just expectations of its founders. The existence of such a society, or, in its place, of the Statute-fair, mainly depends upon the farmers, who, as a class, are slow to be touched and moved into new ways. *Stare super antiquas vias* is an excellent motto, but, like other excellent things, may be misapplied. Does any one doubt that it is to misapply it to rest Statute-fairs or Mops upon it?

In the evidence given a few years ago before a Royal Commission, on the subject of the County Police, it was stated that all the well-known bad characters regularly attended the Mops and Statutes as a matter of business—a statement that has been, and can be, abundantly con-

firmed. So that, it is not only to the advantage of the employers, but much more to the well-being of the employed, and the community at large, that the excision from the body politic of the festering sore and plague-spot of the Statute-fair should be steadily taken in hand. The benefit of the majority should overrule the convenience of the few, even if Statute-fairs were a necessity to the farmer, which they clearly are not. The farmer who would now risk his chance of hiring at a Mop the black-sheep of a distant parish is not even alive to his own worldly interests, much less to the moral welfare of his servants. At a registration office he can obtain a better labourer on surer terms; and if he would be not only wise, but just, he will engage his servants as other employers of labour do, and not after the fashion of a slave-owner.

Medical Lecturers and Theological Students.



IMPROVEMENT in a class so important as the medical is not a thing to be overlooked. It is indeed very cheering. Individual instances of eminent piety amongst surgeons and physicians have never been wanting. But, as the rule, their peculiar early training and subsequent pursuits were said and supposed to be unfavourable to the cultivation of religious emotions and habits. Nor can this be wondered at, when their education and its circumstances (at least in London), in past years, were alike so unfortunate at that critical period of life which usually determines the best or the worst parts of the subsequent character. Sir Humphry Davy mentions medical lectures under cover of which the lecturer elaborately sought to inculcate the grossest materialism. And though he always found, he added, that a walk alongside the banks of a river, or a wood, sufficed to scatter to the winds the subtle sophistries he had listened to, yet it is too much to hope that the majority of his fellow-students, and their successors in the same schools, destitute of his poetical temperament, could so happily and easily shake off the poisonous effects of such pestilential teaching. We all remember, too, Mr. Dickens' specimen of a certain class of medical students in the person of Mr. Bob Sawyer, which, though a caricature, was yet sufficiently true to illustrate the dangers, social, moral, and religious, to which their professional career in London exposed nearly all who entered upon it. Too much has been written upon this striking and formerly notorious evil in a medical student's life to need more than a passing allusion, and a regret that more has not been done to reduce it to a minimum. The collegiate shelter, and its moral and social advantages, now possessed by many, are equally needed by all. Dr. Martin recommends "an extension of the collegiate system," and hopes to see the present college greatly enlarged, and that which is the great desideratum of the times—means for the improvement, especially the social improvement, of the students—greatly extended.

These remarks have been suggested by a perusal of the condensed reports in the public papers of the annual inauguration lectures, delivered at the opening of the Metropolitan Medical Schools on the first of October, in obedience to a time-honoured custom. We were truly gratified to find so many men belonging to this influential class, and distinguished by such high literary and scientific attainments as these lectures evidence, not only eminent in their own proper profession, but promulgating before the rising generation such admirable sentiments as may be culled out of these abridged addresses. It brightens our uncertain gaze into the dark future of our race. It would be difficult indeed, we believe, to find such a combination of high and ennobling excellences in a similar number of addresses from an equal number of lecturers in any other profession. It is impossible not to congratulate the students who had the privilege of listening to such instructions, and the golden opportunity of imbibing their living

spirit, so much of which evaporates before the solitary reader. And we cannot but believe that when, in onward years, they shall be scattered over the face of the earth in pursuit of their avocations, moulded by such wise instructions, not a few of them will carry blessings to their fellow-creatures even more to be prized than those of their immediate profession.

But we will not indulge in further general remarks, inviting as the topic is, our immediate object being to point out how appropriate to the *theological student* are the important lessons so earnestly inculcated upon the medical student, as the sole condition of any results that deserve the name of success. For it is a trite observation, needing little or no elucidation, that there is a resemblance between the two professions. Both have for their object the healing of the diseases which sin has, alike in both cases, entailed upon human nature. The difference between the kind of diseases is great indeed, one of them appealing to sight and sense, and demanding only material remedies; the other appealing to faith, and demanding faith's immaterial remedies: yet are both equally real, the visible and the invisible, and equally capable of relief, or cure, or failing these, of exercising their destroying power. For the stone and cancer are not more real and destructive of the bodily health, than are pride, ambition, and revenge, real and destructive of the soul's health. And it is the duty of the professors of both these healing arts, in the striking language of Dr. William Cholomley, "to wield and apply all the means and appliances which Infinite Mercy has placed at the command of man, to remedy all the pains and woes he has called on himself from Infinite Justice."

We were most of all struck, however, with the almost enthusiastic eulogies which these gentlemen lavish on their profession. It is not known to us if the members of our own, or of any other profession, excepting in rare cases, thus exalt their calling. Dr. Priestly in these terms magnified his office:—"The profession the gentlemen before him had chosen deserved all their reverence; it was worthy of their utmost efforts to cultivate, and unless fully impressed with the dignity of their calling, they would be at best mere grovellers. Studying and practising medicine only as a means of living, for the mere gain it brought, they would be little better than Bunyan's man with the muck-rake, engrossed by ignoble cares, content with raking together straws, regardless of the golden crown within their reach. Perhaps no stronger recommendation could exist rightly to esteem their profession, than the fact that it fulfilled in the highest degree the teaching of that true philosophy, which holds that it is better than aught else to do good."

Golden words indeed! Would that their very spirit could be imbibed by every theological student who aspires to do well the great task he has undertaken to prepare himself for! For of his own profession Dr. Priestly says it is "second only to the clerical profession, inasmuch as the care of souls is of greater moment than the care of men's bodies." In concluding his very able address (say the papers) Dr. Priestly urged upon the students "the importance of earnestness of purpose, a genuine love of truth—of steady earnest work, with careful and correct observation and diligent study—specially pointing out the desirableness of learning to speak not only in public, but privately in communication with his patients."

The lecturer speaks of the "reverence due to their profession." But how is this most important mental state, so justly due to his profession and so fruitful of the best results, to be created in the student of theology? For it does not come by chance. It does not of its own accord take up its abode naturally with the dreamer, the vain-glorious aspirant after any one's plaudits, the schemer after wealth and honours. One of the best means of producing and fostering a "reverence" for one's profession appears to be, the consciousness that we have self-denyingly worked to fit ourselves for the faithful discharge of its duties. At all events, this is the first condition of conscientious self-respect. But he who has indolently refused the labour necessary for the acquisition

of solid attainments in theology must be conscious that he is but doing what almost any one of those whom he sets himself up to teach could do as well as he can—servilely making use of other people's prayers and materials; and, as he could originate nothing equal, or at all comparable, to them, neither can he, therefore, appreciate their true value, or wisely employ them. No one can properly use another man's sermons who has not done all within his power to compose his own. We do not understand, in such case, how a man can deeply "reverence" a profession which has made so few demands on those nobler parts of our nature, amongst which "reverence" has its imperceptible birth and growth. But to what are we to trace the fault of a clergyman who has neglected the golden season of youth for the acquisition of professional knowledge?

This question may be answered in some measure by a few brief remarks upon the different methods of education pursued by the two professions. We are too little acquainted with the "apprentice-life" of which Dr. Priestly speaks, neither disparagingly, nor much otherwise, to know the exact place it holds in a scheme of medical education. But let us suppose it possible that it may not be wholly unlike the University career of a divinity-student, in this respect—that it is merely theoretical and preliminary to the higher professional studies and their application in practice. The four years spent afterwards in London by the medical student introduce him amongst the worst diseases incident to human bodies, and also to the best lecturers and teachers in his profession on the best methods of dealing with them. Such a course seems to the bystander to be complete. No incompetent practitioner, it appears to us, can look back and blame the system under which he was trained, as the cause of, or an excuse for, his ignorance.

And it is here that the comparison we are instituting must fail; the divinity-student has nothing, worth speaking of, comparable to the admirable discipline of those four years of a medical student's life, for supplementing the imperfect training of an open University career. The case may be presented thus:—A youth enters one of the Universities; remains there, but too often little better than an idler, for three years; passes an examination which, useful as it is, serves equally well for the lawyer, the barrister, the soldier, or the merchant; afterwards spends a few months in two necessarily elementary courses of theology, one required by his University, the other by the ordaining bishop—and then rushes into his sacred calling with the very minimum of preparation for the efficient discharge of its duties. As yet he can have no solid theological knowledge to enable him to dispense with further studies—has usually to acquire nearly all his skill in the composition of sermons—besides those nameless attainments which come to the self-taught curate or incumbent so slowly, and are often bought at so dear a price.

Or, let us turn to the more hopeful case of one who has taken high mathematical honours at his University. With what qualifications does he commence his divinity-studies? He has succeeded in one branch of knowledge, and now he has to try if he can succeed in another. Of course such a man must set before him a higher standard of attainments. He knows how the mathematician is made, and he is able to take a wider survey of the processes by which the theologian is to be made. Will he gird himself up for the undertaking? Perhaps he thinks he will, and sets himself to examine his qualifications for the arduous task. He may have heard of Blackstone's doctrine, that it takes twenty years' lucubrations to make an able lawyer; and he may have heard others say that the theologian may spend the same number of years over his studies, and yet leave fields unexplored. What preparation, then, he asks, has his early education made for his undertaking, corresponding with those which made his success at the University comparatively easy? Common sense even will suggest to him, that the critical student of the Old Testament should be an easy master of the imperfect language in which it has pleased God

to hand it down throughout all generations, till its revelations shall be no longer needed. But neither at school, nor at college, was he taught even the elements of Hebrew. Will he put himself to school again, consent to the drudgery of mastering the language, as alone it can be fairly and confidently mastered, by becoming a schoolboy again over the details of grammar, exercises, and composition? Many have made the attempt. Few believed the advantages could justify the sacrifices they found it relentlessly demanded. Here, then, is one absolute condition of high success lost, and with it its helps towards fostering that "veneration" for his profession which would lead him to "magnify" it, as we find those life-long medical labourers magnifying theirs.

It is not necessary to pursue this line of thought into further details. We will only add a not irrelevant remark, that the qualifications which led to success in the technicalities of mathematical and classical studies do not necessarily ensure similar success when applied to theology. For both the former the taste was acquired at school under long-continued and imperceptible influences. For theology, in its higher aspects, he has yet to create it, in any true sense of its yielding its own rewards. And now, settled, perhaps, in some obscure country parsonage, he lacks the spur of tutors, examinations, rivalries, rewards. He finds, too, that a very small amount of reading will *apparently* suffice for the rôle assigned him, and concludes that the labours requisite for investigating the bye-paths of theology are not demanded by his providential position in the Church—that he may lawfully, therefore, devote himself to more agreeable avocations. Fatal mistake in him who is conscious that God has given him the student's vocation and opportunities! If ever called upon to address listening students, such an one will never attempt, and will fail if he make the attempt, to awaken in them that enthusiasm for their calling, without which, in larger or smaller measure, no success worthy the name, in any pursuit demanding systematic labour, self-denial, and fair play given to the highest faculties of our nature, was ever obtained.

But *cui bono* so much learning? Passing by the inestimable advantages to youthful blood of regular occupation, of having an excuse for entering but sparingly into society, of taking from Satan one of his most effective instruments for corrupting and destroying souls—*indolence*—a certain amount of study is *demanded* of the minister of Christ as a plain duty, for the neglect of which a reckoning day will assuredly come, either in this life or the next. How far providential circumstances may be favourable or unfavourable, whether they will furnish an excuse, or should act as a spur, must be settled between the conscience and Him who has lit up that candle within us, to tell every honourable agent of His purposes what He expects of him. The *cui bono* supposed to be asked for is certainly not to introduce the week's studies, in their crude shape, into the next Sunday's exhortation. But how much better will he exhort, who, instead of the half-dozen threadbare reasons of the man whose student days ended at his ordination, can introduce that fresh supply which continued study is sure to furnish from the inexhaustible storehouses of professional literature. The case, however, may be put generally thus:—If God has thought fit to give a revelation of His will in one large book, it is absolutely the highest duty of every professional expounder of it to labour to master its contents, and all that he can comprehend for their illustration. That no knowledge of this kind will be ever lost to the practical mind we hold to be certain. It will come out at some time, and when least expected, and then he will learn to thank God that he did not suffer the poor amusements of life to divert him from life's real purposes.

What, then, does our Church especially want as a trainer for Christ's ambassadors? Something, we believe, that shall as nearly as possible approximate to the four years' study of theories and practice demanded of the medical student. Some approach has been made to this by the establishment of Theological colleges, supplementary to

Oxford and Cambridge. We believe that the perfection of this scheme is a problem deserving the earnest thought of every Churchman. The medical student, it must be remembered, cannot be allowed to practise without this probation. We hope to see this reasonable demand applied to our Theological colleges. Many difficulties belong to this question; and so they must to many a parent who consents to train his child for a medical life. But yet they are surmounted. Perhaps, too, if this second collegiate course should ever become law, and no longer be left to caprice, it might help to enforce more economical, and therefore purifying habits, amidst the temptations of the older Universities, and thus the present waste in the first course would go far towards meeting the demands of the second.

Having spoken in admiration of the improved moral tone of the medical profession, we are unwilling to conclude without a few specimens, which may come home to us all. The materialistic motives of worldly honour and wealth, as the motives for study and labour, are absolutely condemned by the lecturers. How far more powerfully should such warning words come home to the clergyman. "The medical practitioner," said Dr. Sieveking, "must look for a higher and nobler reward, in the consciousness that he was to the best of his ability carrying out the purpose to which he was ordained by his Creator."

And again: "How serious the responsibility even of those whose consciences rebuked them not for time mispent and opportunities wasted—how intolerable should it be to those who have failed to acquire knowledge which might sometimes have turned the scale between life and death!"

In strains of true eloquence Professor William Fox thus seeks to awaken the noblest aspirations in his auditors:—

"What is to be the reward of the student for this life of self-denying exertion? That of an approving conscience in work done in that noblest of missions in which the Redeemer of the world chose to manifest His power and love to man; that of gratitude full and abundant from those to whom they would often be the best earthly friends, and which, if you wish to secure it, you must ever strive to deserve, by regarding suffering humanity with a true sympathy, which, while it takes the form of practical benevolence, does not forget the sorrow and suffering which sickness entails."

In concluding his address he said:—"And if fame should not be your lot—if this short day should end in digging, amid the storm and cloud and the gloom, steps by which others might ascend to wider views and more perfect knowledge—they had the consolation of knowing that life did not end here, but that the future had a higher tribunal in that great muster-roll of the ages, when the names of the great and the good will be judged by a loftier standard than that of short-sighted human wisdom, and those of the true benefactors of humanity, and earnest seekers after truth, shall stand written in letters of light. Might theirs be found also there as those of true labourers in the field of knowledge which God had appointed them to enrich and replenish, and might they find an appropriate reward in this removal for ever of the 'burden and mystery' of this world, and find the fulfilment of the great philosopher's final prayer—*Quare si in operibus tuis sudabimus, facies nos visionis tue et Sabbati tui participes*—'the vision of perfect knowledge and the Sabbath of labour' not in vain."

We will add but one more specimen and then conclude. Mr. Hutchinson "reminded those present that although they would be learning throughout life, yet that the years of studentship must be considered their seed-time. He begged them to be liberal in sowing, and assured them that the attempt to save the seed-corn (whether as regarded their money or their labour) would inevitably prejudice the harvest. And now, gentlemen, I cannot find words to express how much I desire that the session to which this lecture is introductory may be one of earnest work. Let us, both teachers and students, devote to our vocation all the time, all the thought, all the vigour that we can command. I might adduce many cogent motives, but will cite but one, which includes all.

"Thyself and thy belongings
Are not thine own so proper, as to waste
Thyself upon thy virtues, they on thee.
Heaven doth with us as we with torches, use,
Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not. Spirits are not finely touch'd
But to fine issues: nor nature never lends—

(Mark that word 'lends,' gentlemen. It is a loan and not a gift. It is that which no honest man would ever dare to misappropriate).

"Nor nature never lends
The smallest scruple of her excellence;
But like a thrifty goddess she determines
Herself the glory of a creditor,
Both thanks, and use."

Reason v. Conscience in the Literate or Scholar.

"So then, there be four men in whom oftentimes this conflict between the conscience and the reason doth arise, and where reason is apt to gain the day; the literate, or scholar; the poet; the theologian; and the politician."—SIRION.



THE conflict between Reason and Conscience is as old as the human race. Some traces of it will be found to mark every age in the annals of the history of the world; and specially those ages in which thought has been most active. Our own age therefore feels, and has yet to feel, deeply this inner strife, and will furnish us many examples in each of the classes suggested by our motto. In selecting from those examples our aim is not specially to discuss any one man's individual views or to do battle especially with him; but to take him as the type of a class, and show in what way every man and every writer must be and is affected who allows his intellect to hold dominion over his conscience. We select Mr. Buckle as the literate or scholar, who, allowing intellect to be the sole and supreme guide, both in matters of faith and knowledge, is the representative of a class of thinkers and writers who tacitly, or openly, ignore the existence of conscience altogether. They may not go the extreme length which he does, but they entirely accord with the spirit of his doctrine and his general positions.

Thus runs his creed, if creed it can be called, stated as nearly as possible in his own words. According to him CONSCIENCE, or CONSCIOUSNESS as he calls it, is not a faculty, but a mere state and condition of the mind; and even if it were a faculty it is not infallible. Men cannot be rightly guided or controlled by what is fallible; not, therefore, by the conscience. Every event that happens, every word a man utters, every action he commits, is linked to its antecedent by an inevitable connection, such antecedent being connected with some preceding fact. Thus the whole world forms a necessary chain in which each man may play his part, but can by no means determine what that part shall be. The dogmas of Free-will and Predestination that have risen, Mr. Buckle thinks, from the doctrines of Chance and Necessity, are simply deemed worthy of utter derision; though it is hard to understand how he can with justice to his own theory condemn both. "The opposite doctrines," he says, "of free-will and predestination do, no doubt, supply a safe and simple solution of the obscurities of our being;" but both doctrines are wrong.

Having thus in some measure cleared the ground, having condemned Conscience as an utterly worthless guide, even if it has any existence, and denounced free-will and predestination as having "corrupted the sources of our knowledge," he leaves us to the guidance of a refined but unequivocal fatalism, which makes man the mere creature of antecedent circumstances of which he can have no knowledge, the sport of influences over which he has no control; having no witness of the truth within him, and no power of free will either to resist or to acquiesce in the chain of events which binds him, and no guide but

his own knowledge of facts. On this theory he views the history of the world, and on this foundation builds what he calls the science of its civilization. If this theory be in any sense true, and the foundation anything but rotten sand, man stripped of all power of morally knowing either good or evil, as well as all capacity of choice, becomes a mere machine; a superior sort of steam-engine, the motive-power being his intellect or reason, that his supreme rule and sole guide. Mr. Buckle wrote his book on the *History of Civilization* and in it attacked all that the Christian world holds dear, and much that the wisest and best men of every age have counted truest and best,—simply because in the course of events the time was come for a certain man to write a certain book in a certain spirit and in a certain form. The critic who reviews Mr. Buckle's theory and attempts to weigh it in the balance of truth—the reader who judges it unpalatable, unsound and poisonous—he who counts it wise and wholesome, and prefers it to that older doctrine proclaimed eighteen centuries ago; one and all alike play their part in the drama from no moral conviction of the truth, no inner voice or witness echoing and answering to the appeal; but simply and only because out of every million of men, according to certain infallible statistics, certain individuals must emerge and do certain things in a certain way. Nor is this all. We are told that, "in the same states of society the same crimes are necessarily reproduced;" and by the same law, of course, the same virtues and the same heroisms. The late Mr. Greenacre, who became infamous throughout the world for the butchery of his wife, Mr. Rush for that of his master, or any other scoundrel for the shedding of human blood; Howard, who visited the sick and dying in prison, Messrs. Burke and Hare, who trafficked in human flesh, and Wilberforce, who spent his life and utmost energies in denouncing the atrocities of the Slave Trade; Gehazi, who lied for the sake of paltry lucre, and all the unknown thousands who perished in the flame rather than deny the Truth; the wretched miscreant who was hanged on the 20th of October, at Newgate, for secret poisoning, and Florence Nightingale, who, by her work of loving mercy, has crowned both these names with imperishable beauty;—all alike had no power or choice in the matter and could have done no other than what they did.

The first effect, therefore, of this theory of a chain of antecedent events, connected each with each as link with link, which assigns to every man his place, and decides infallibly what that work shall be, is to remove all freedom of the human will; and that removed all human responsibility at once and for ever is destroyed.

After this, all that follows in our author's train of deduction, theory, reasoning, and assertion, is but what we might most naturally and justly expect. Men have no freedom of will; they cannot choose deliberately between good and evil; if we knew enough of a man's antecedents we could tell exactly how each would act, what he would do and what he would say. He has no inner witness or echo of the truth to guide him, to help him to decide whether Baal be God, or God be Baal; whether truth is better than a lie, or a lie more expedient than the truth. To his intellect and his power of knowing—to his understanding and perception of facts—to this alone can he turn. Let him take his stand upon some one incontrovertible fact—say that $2 + 2 = 4$, or one assumed to be equally incontrovertible, e. g. that certain nations eat rice and therefore their lot is abject slavery. On facts like these he may build what structure he pleases. He has only to increase the number of such facts, and the accuracy of his knowledge of them, to enlarge the domain over which his intellect is to hold sway, and he may not only read the history of the past life, but map out with accuracy the future life and conditions of each individual man, of nations and of peoples. Not only may he foretell for others and for himself what virtues shall be wrought, or what villainy be done, but even "the number of persons whose memory will fail them as to the direction of a letter," at any given time in any given thousands, *Ipse sibi doctor* need be his only motto, self his only guide. He is to believe "that

before another century has elapsed the chain of evidence will be complete, and it will then be as easy to demonstrate the *regularity* of the *moral* world as of the *material*."

That Mr. Buckle believed this, and relied solely on himself, and the power of intellect alone for guidance absolute and supreme, is evident throughout his whole volume; and strangely enough, or rather most naturally, in the facts of his own early life. He had, says a recent and impartial eulogist and biographer, "an instinct for self-education" from his earliest years. When a boy of fourteen at school, having gained a prize, he claimed, as a reward, his removal from the restraints of school, and the carrying on of his education at home, under his own sole guidance. His request was granted, and the boy set out on the sea of knowledge, and of speculation, without a pilot. All his studies gradually tended towards the one focus of intellectual progress, and the march of civilization; and the result was, as might be naturally expected, that he set up an intellectual standard to measure the growth and stature of men and of nations. With the true lives of men, their hearts and consciences, he had no acquaintance, and, therefore, he took no count of them at the tribunal which he set up. It is said that he spent twenty years—working ten or twelve hours a day—on his task of proving the might, the value, and the glory of the human intellect. It is certain that he spared neither time, nor toil, nor self-denial, in striving to achieve this task; and the result is his teaching us, in substance, that all true human greatness, nobility, and moral worth are mainly, if not entirely, owing to differences of food, climate, and other physical circumstances, over which men may have little or no control; that no higher, purer, light than that of mere intellect has ever shone among men; they have never seen or followed any such light; there has been no growth of the inner man, no increase of wisdom, and of stature, apart from the increase of new facts. They have, indeed, now and then, asserted that they have seen the light, and felt its warmth, its regenerating life; that they have grown stronger, purer, better, wiser, happier, by heeding and following it. But this is an entire mistake. We have Mr. Buckle's word for it that no such growth in moral worth, and intellectual power, have ever thus gone together hand in hand. The men who believed, and, above all, the men who taught any such doctrine as this, that *God's kingdom, i.e. the growth of light from above, the purity and increase of moral conviction, the clearness and truthfulness of man's conscience, is actually going on in men's hearts, and that this, the truest of all life, the noblest of all progress, is inseparably connected with the reception of certain profound truths given by God to man*—these men, he tells us with bitter vehemence, have been in every age not the friends, but the relentless foes, of all advancement, progress, learning, and happiness. Whatever phase any such belief or doctrine as this may have taken, he simply brands it as bigotry worthy only of contempt and detestation. This is one aspect of the position he takes; and of so glaring and transparent a delusion there is no need, nor is this the place, to take further notice than to say that, if it were true, the dawn of Christianity on the darkness of the world must be regarded as the greatest calamity that could have ever befallen it.

Man's FREE-WILL and RESPONSIBILITY being abolished, and CONSCIENCE having no existence, the rest of his theory follows as a matter of course. Law, commerce, the arts and learning are spoken of as bases of civilization, as seeds in the element of true progress, while religion is wholly omitted,—but as a drag on the wheel. In short, according to this view, war and peace, law and religion, different forms of government, art, literature, and manners, are all alike merely phenomena of national life. They come and go, rise and die, fade away and recur, spring up and culminate, according to certain fixed laws, which Mr. Buckle, had he lived long enough, would have told us, and which some future disciple will tell us during the next century or so. Till then we must, and can well afford to, wait. The assertion that a history of human life can be gathered

from statistics, and that He from whom man's breath first came does *not* govern the earth, which indeed is swayed (or sways itself) by what are termed the laws of nature, is far older than Mr. Buckle. It has numbered too many centuries, and been too often refuted, now to require formal refutation. It is as difficult now as ever it was to believe that not a sparrow falls to the ground, that not a Buckle perishes, without Him in whom all live and move and have being; but it is *no less true*. Again and again, as the ages go by, will men be found who can neither understand nor believe that God rules the earth and all that happens in it, but who offer you a dissected map of the plan on which they see it must be and ought to be governed. They say their say, or write their book, and possibly unsettle and perplex many minds already too full of perplexity, doubt, and fear. But the world goes on; the generations of men rise and fall, live and die; truth grows apace; the wheat and the tares both grow; and over the whole mingled domain of light and darkness, truth and error, confusion and faith, still One rules Who is greater than all.

Mr. Buckle, says his biographer, "sinned the sin of excessive generalization;" he relied on statistics which represent a few only of the elements of social life. He took it for granted that men under similar circumstances will be similar themselves; similar in spite of the disturbance of human passion, human frailty, custom or accident; in spite of every conviction of the conscience, every teaching of religion, every emotion of the heart; and in his eyes the whole system of human life, since it began, is nothing more than one huge, complicated, disordered machine, working as it were in certain fixed cycles, a mere iron system of cold and bloodless irresponsibility. He begins by clamouring for liberty of thought without the restraints of conscience, or any control higher than the sway of man's own intellect; he ends by setting up a theory of iron despotism that crushes the noblest parts of man's nature, and gives a licence only to pride and self-conceit, while destroying its consciousness, free agency, and responsibility. The rise or fall of a nation, the growth of a people, the rank which it holds among the nations, may be affected and decided by the number of earthquakes which befall it, by its fickle climate, by the beef or rice, fish or potatoes, which it consumes,—but it is neither made nor marred, nor is its progress to be measured, by its saints or sinners, by its great statesmen or political adventurers, by its brave captains or cowards, by sovereigns who ruled in and by the grace of God, or those who defied Him, or denied His existence; by the sanctity, and purity, by the open profligacy, of private life, or by its splendour or infamy in public. They were what they were, and did what they did, simply because they could neither be nor do otherwise. Play a part in the great drama they must; but what that should be, or how they were to do it,—it is not for them to decide. To such a *caput mortuum* as this we utterly decline to accede; recommended though it be by learning, and research, ingenuity and skill, even tenfold greater than those of its latest exponent. The old Pagan's words—

"—Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή,"

did not suffice for the deep needs of man's spiritual nature two thousand years ago. They will not suffice now in an age of greater light, greater knowledge, greater human pride, and greater responsibility.

Comprehension.



A meeting of some friends of Liturgical Reform held at Keswick, it was unanimously resolved to form an Association for the one specific purpose of giving a more extended circulation to the able and temperate article entitled *Church Expansion and Liturgical Revision*, which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for January, 1861, without, by any means, committing itself to every sentiment contained in that article,

but looking only to its admirable adaptation *as a whole* to promote such a revision of the Book of Common Prayer, as shall tend to an enlarged comprehension, within the Established Church, of those who hold the fundamental doctrines of our Protestant faith, &c." On these grounds, it seems, all the Clergy of England are to have the article sent to them, while, at the same time, they are modestly asked for contributions towards the printing and postage. Now, in the first place, it appears pretty clear that if the Keswick Reformers are philanthropic, they can scarcely be thought very able. The most that they can do for oppressed humanity is to print and circulate an article with parts of which they by no means agree, but which they think, *as a whole*, may be useful. Could not one of these kind gentlemen have composed something on the subject which his coadjutors might have entirely approved of, and which might have proved beneficial to the benighted Church, not only as a whole, but in all its parts also? It seems, however, that this was beyond the mark of the Keswick coterie. They wish to instruct and enlighten, but they have no better means of doing this than by a composition which they themselves partially condemn. Indeed, it is hard to imagine in what strange state of confusion their united brains must have been when they made up their minds to spend their money and expose the weakness of their cause by printing such a weak tirade as the article in question. As they have been so good as to send us a copy, we cannot, we think, return the favour better than by pointing out to them the very meagre and unsatisfactory nature of the performance, and seriously urging it upon them not to waste any more of the funds of the Society for *Church Expansion* in circulating such extremely poor stuff. We are told by the writer of the article that the famous blue and yellow publication made a solemn prophecy fifty years ago, and that prophecy was, that if "the Establishment" did not adopt the principles of the *Edinburgh Review*, it would not last half a century. It is candid, certainly, to bring forward an instance of such an entire failure in prediction, and it somehow encourages us to hope that the second prophecy, now made, that if the Church in the *next* half century does not mend her ways, she must be overturned, may also be a mistake. It has been well said, "You cannot argue with a prophet, but you may disbelieve him;" and we most entirely disbelieve the somewhat discredited vaticinations in question. We are told that the Church has hitherto survived by assuming more of the popular character; if so, the *Edinburgh Reviewer* may very safely leave her alone, for this, we suppose, is the very object of the *Review*, and if the Church is popularizing herself, all is well.

But to leave the Church to her own legitimate and healthy growth, to assist her in her great work of educating the people up to her standard, to make way for her energies to display themselves, and her real power to be proved—this is, we fear, the very last object of the *Reviewer*. He would make her yield and bend; give up her time-honoured creeds, pare down her liturgies, sacrifice her catholic tone, in a word, abandon what she believes to be *the truth*—and all for what?—To meet "the complaints and representations of Dissenters." Not, indeed, as he hastens to add, that "those complaints are always just, or those representations always true!" Church-expanders of Keswick, could not ye find a more cunning scribe than this? Here is an argument for revision and comprehension with a vengeance. One would think that before so vital a change was demanded, the advocates of it should at least have made up their minds as to the truth of the representations on which it was demanded. But no—all is foggy and muddy in the brain of this Scotch dialectician. Somebody (we don't know who) says that something (we don't know what) is wrong, (we don't know why). Therefore, let us change everything, and sacrifice all the old landmarks to comprehend our perplexed and benighted wanderers. But while all this is to be done for the sake of the undefined and sufficiently vague dissenter, or the few restless spirits among the clergy, who are always clamouring for some change or other, what account is taken of the great body

of true and faithful Churchmen who do not want change; who would rather not have revision, and who think comprehension anything but a desirable object? The writer in the *Edinburgh* will indeed scarce condescend to notice such creatures, who, of course, have no right to claim to have an opinion in the matter. But for their sakes we desire to put on record a few remarks on this much-abused subject of comprehension.

In our view, then, Church expansion or comprehension is fundamentally and necessarily mischievous—a device which never has succeeded—and which, from the nature of the case, can never succeed. The notion of comprehension is to sacrifice something which you think useful or true, while another, on his part, sacrifices something which he thinks useful and true; the object of both sacrifices being that you and he may meet on common ground and act together. Now, in both cases, the sacrifice of true and useful things is confessedly an evil: will then this evil be overpowered by a greater good? We leave out of the question the point as to the rightness of doing evil that good may come. We ask, *does* good come? and we answer, it does not come, and cannot come. The compromise that has been made strikes at the very heart of the religion of those who have made it. It weakens their faith, it throws discredit on their creeds, it destroys their zeal. How shall a man contend earnestly for that which he holds in a maimed and imperfect form? What will he care for the success of a religion that is only half his own? The best thing that can happen to him is the ordinary result in such cases—that he should begin to quarrel with his newly-comprehended friends, and that they should mutually return to the *status in quo ante*.

In the year 1691 the Presbyterians and Independents agreed to hash up their theology into a common hotch-potch, and to join in a comprehension scheme. They had been pretty good friends before, but now they began at once to quarrel, and in a few years wisely arranged a separation. They could not have continued united and at peace without toning down their religion into a mere conventional morality. Yet, in the face of all that history teaches, in the face of so many comprehension schemes weakly advocated and happily defeated, there is still a set of men among us who call for Church comprehension, and seriously argue that a man should be admitted to minister in the Church without declaring his assent and consent to the formularies he is going to use—that is, in plain words, that a man should be allowed to minister and teach that which he does not believe to be true. We trust that the kind project of the Keswick associates for converting the clergy and laity of England to this doctrine will not prove successful. We are sure it will not if men will only take a plain common-sense view of the matter, and ask themselves how much a man would care about his estate if he had to sacrifice his own tastes to those of his neighbour in laying it out; or how the farmer or manufacturer would prosper if they were bound not to be guided by their own judgment, but by those of others. Why then, in the sacred concerns of religion, are we to give up what we believe to be the truth for the sake of those who desire "larger Christian liberty of thought;" to sacrifice the Baptismal Service to please the Anabaptist, and the Eucharist to humour the Quaker; to give up forms of prayer to satisfy the Plymouth Brethren, and to shelve the Bible out of a tender regard for the scruples of the Mormons?

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.



EXICO.—August 28.—Two thousand five hundred French troops land at Vera Cruz. The French communication between the coast and the interior repeatedly interrupted. Fifteen to twenty persons dying daily in Vera Cruz.

AMERICA.—September 14.—Commencement of the

battles in Maryland which end in the evacuation of that State by the Confederates.

The Federal Colonel Miles, with 6,000 men, surrenders at Harper's Ferry to General Jackson. The Federals paroled.

September 15.—Battle near Sharpsburg between General M'Clellan and the Confederates under General Lee.

September 17.—Another battle, when General Lee was reinforced by General Stonewall Jackson, who had recrossed the Potomac into Maryland. General M'Clellan also received reinforcements.

September 18.—The Confederates evacuate Harper's Ferry after destroying all the Government stores and the pontoon bridge, and partly destroying the bridge of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

September 20.—The Confederates recross the Potomac into Virginia.

September 22.—President Lincoln issues a proclamation to the effect that in January, 1863, all slaves within any State or part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the Federal Government, shall be then thenceforward and for ever free.

September 23.—The Republican journals approve President Lincoln's proclamation, but say that it will have no effect.

September 24.—The Governor of New York State issues an order for a draft of 40,000 men on Oct. 10.

September 25.—President Lincoln suspends the writ of *habeas corpus*, and declares marshal law throughout the United States, with respect to all persons arrested for aiding the rebellion, or hindering the draft.

General White placed under arrest, pending an investigation of the circumstances attending the surrender of Harper's Ferry.

The Governors of sixteen Union States meet in Washington, where they present an address to President Lincoln, expressing their determination to support his constitutional authority, approving the emancipation proclamation, and suggesting the expediency of raising a reserved force of 100,000 men. The Governor of Maryland objects to sign the address approving the emancipation proclamation.

W. Roupell, late M.P. for Lambeth, tried for forgery and sentenced to penal servitude for life.

September 30.—The *Gazette* contains the official amalgamation of the Indian army with that of the Queen, the Royal cavalry being continued from the 18th Hussars, and the infantry of the line from the 100th foot.

AMERICA.—October 3.—General M'Clellan issues a congratulatory general order to the troops for their conduct in the battles of South Mountain and Antietam. He states that the Federal triumph is evidenced by the capture of fourteen guns, 15,000 stand of arms, and 6,000 prisoners.

October 8.—A battle is fought at Perrysville, in Kentucky, between the Federals under General Buell, and the Confederates under General Bragg. General Buell officially reports that it lasted from 10 a.m. till dark, and adds: "The enemy was repulsed, but not without some momentary advantage on the left. The main body of the enemy fell back in the direction of Harrodsburg. Our loss is probably pretty heavy, including valuable officers."

October 9.—The Confederates under General Stuart again cross the Potomac, at Hancock, into Maryland.

October 10.—The Confederates occupy Mercersburg, and Chambersburg, in Pennsylvania. Their force is estimated at 3,000 men, their advance consisting of 1,000 cavalry and six pieces of artillery. Chambersburg surrendered on the condition that private property should be respected, but that public property would be removed or destroyed. The Confederates move in the direction of Gettysburg, to destroy the bridge at that point, and prevent the approach of General M'Clellan's troops.

HOLLAND.—October 5. The law for the abolition of slavery in the Dutch West Indies, passes the States-General by a majority of 45 to 7. The abolition to commence on the 1st July, 1863, and the owners to receive a compensation of 120 dollars for each slave.

The King of Italy signs a decree granting an amnesty

to all persons concerned in the acts and attempts which took place lately in the Southern provinces, with the exception of those who deserted from the Royal army.

October 13.—*Coup d'état* in Prussia. The Chambers closed by the King.

FRANCE.—October 18.—M. Drouyn de Lhuys, having succeeded M. Thouvenel as Minister of Foreign Affairs, issues a circular on the Roman question to the representatives of France abroad.

From the *London Gazette*, Tuesday, October 21.—Whitehall, Oct. 20. The following telegraphic despatch has been received from Earl Granville, dated Brussels, Saturday, Oct. 18, 3.10 p.m.

"Her Majesty the Queen left Coburg yesterday at 3 p.m., and arrived at the Lacken station at 9 a.m. this day."

The Queen has been pleased to order a *congé d'élire* to pass the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, of Great Britain and Ireland, empowering the Dean and Chapter of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury to elect an Archbishop of that see, the same being void by the death of Dr. John Bird Sumner, late Archbishop thereof; and Her Majesty has also been pleased to recommend to the said Dean and Chapter the Most Rev. Father in God Dr. Charles Thomas Longley, now Archbishop of York, to be by them elected Archbishop of the said See of Canterbury.

REVIEWS.

A Review of the Baptismal Controversy.



HIS is a disappointing book. We are not speaking of it in respect to the general issue of the argument—this is much as we had anticipated—but in respect to the conduct of the argument. We had expected, as we thought we had reason to expect, a forcible logic. This is just what we do not find. We did not bear in mind that, where there is unsoundness in the Faith, the intellect is never truly and vigorously exercised upon points of the Faith, however acute and subtle and powerful it may still be upon points which belong only to this life.

A book of this character cannot be reviewed except in a treatise much of the same length with its own contents. We are not going to attempt anything of the kind. We propose to deal with a few of the "fundamentals" of the book only—with a few of the leading positions and conclusions upon which the book is built. We find these to be unsound; and, as this is so, all the known ability and learning of the author does not make his book a trustworthy book.

First, Mr. Mozley discards the Vincentian rule—*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*—as being "defective in ground of reason," when applied as a "test of an article of the faith." (P. 3.) He does this by a curious process. First, he extends the rule to things to which it does not apply, and then shows that, when so extended, it fails. Of course it does. Now, the Vincentian rule is, that that is an article of the Faith which has been received, AS SUCH, *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*. But Mr. Mozley says, as his account why the rule is defective,—

"No reason can be given why some things not necessary to the faith may not yet, from an early date, have been in matter of fact believed."

Very probably; but "an early date" is not *semper*—and what has become here of *ubique, et ab omnibus*? And, even if Mr. Mozley had made his counter-statement

* *A Review of the Baptismal Controversy*. By J. B. Mozley, B.D., Vicar of Old Shoreham, late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons, Waterloo Place. 1862.

exact, still, if the plain intention of the rule is confined to "articles of the faith," how is it shown to be "defective in ground of reason" by forcing it into connection with points which are *not* "articles of the faith?"

Mr. Mozley passes on to the "negative test" of Article VI:—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

Upon it, he says, three points are to be observed, (p. 7):—

"First, that by Scripture proving a doctrine is meant more than Scripture admitting of being interpreted in consistency with it; secondly, that there is implied in the proof from Scripture an ultimate appeal to our reason as the judge of it; thirdly, that we are concerned in the Canon with the fact of the presence or absence of such proof, as distinguished from any explanations of this fact."

Some things are assumed here which are of the essence of the question between those who agree with Mr. Mozley and those who do not. And, as the Canon is the common property of both, we protest *in limine* against a process which affirms, *quasi ex concessio*, that the Canon means exactly what we hold it does not mean.

Mr. Mozley proceeds to discuss the Canon. But he discusses it loosely, for he does not keep to its exact language, "read therein, nor may be proved thereby." "From" is not "by;" "in" is not "from." The Canon is careful to distinguish. Mr. Mozley labours to confound. If his reasoning have any force—which it is plain to us it has not—the Canon should have stopped at "read therein," as covering everything that is intended by "may be proved thereby."

Again:—

"There is implied in this proof from Scripture an ultimate appeal to our reason as the judge of it."

Mr. Mozley has overlooked two things here—one in *rerum natura*, the other in the Canon itself.

Does he mean by "our reason" the reason of every man, woman, and child who can read the Scriptures? If not—and we may conclude he will say he does not—where is he going to draw the line? Will he tell us where independent judgment ends and authority begins?

But the Canon answers the question. The Canon says, "is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith," &c. "Required"—by whom? By himself? This is absurd. By whom then? The use of the word "required" shows at once that the Canon has reference to an authority *imponens*, and not to the reason of "any man." Mr. Mozley says "the Canon omits to say who is the judge of proof." Certainly, it does not say it in terms. But two things are plain—first, that the Canon refers to an authority *imponens*; second, that that authority *imponens* is *not* "our reason."

Doubtless, it suited Mr. Mozley to get rid of all notion of an authority *imponens*; because, for members of the Church of England, the voice of that authority, speaking in "the ministration of public Baptism of Infants to be used in the Church," is very inconvenient for the purposes of his argument. But if a man of great ability, and high repute as a reasoner, will get rid of inconvenient things τῷ σοφιστικῷ λογῷ, he cannot be surprised that those who see the mischief of his procedure should do what they can to expose it. It is, indeed, to be observed of the whole treatise that, though it refers occasionally to the question of Church authority, it is only to minimise it, or to acquiesce in it *sub modo negandi*. In reality it discards it altogether. It goes with Mr. Mozley for just nothing at all that the Church Catholic has, from the first, held and taught that all infants are regenerate in and by their baptism, as an article of the Faith. It is not "proved from Scripture," he says. Well, the Church says that it is—but the Church is nothing to the Vicar of Shoreham.

Mr. Mozley would, it appears, "acquiesce in an absence of positive doctrine upon the subject." (P. 28.) He would leave it wholly uncertain whether any baptized person, infant or adult, is regenerate in and by their baptism.

He appears—so far as we understand him—to hold that the gift of regeneration is in all cases conditional upon fulfilment of conditions present or subsequent—what he calls "worthiness"—discarding thus all that is objective in the doctrine of the Sacrament. Now, as it is impossible to fix and ascertain this "worthiness" without direct and special revelation, so that of which it is the condition must be matter of uncertainty from birth to death.

But S. Paul says, "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation." What is his foundation? "Repentance from dead works—faith towards God—the doctrine of baptisms, of laying on of hands, of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

"The doctrine of baptisms" was part of S. Paul's foundation: did he build—does he call us to build—upon an "absence of positive doctrine?" Is it thus that the Holy Spirit "guides into all truth?" Why will learned men, in their craving after something new and satisfying to the intellectual power, be wiser than God?

One more instance of Mr. Mozley's logic and we have done. In pages 216-17 of his book he deals with "the dogmatic statement appended to the Service for the Public Baptism of Infants."

"It is certain by God's Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved."

Now, one would have thought that, if it were possible for any form of words to set a question at rest, it had been done here. Mr. Mozley is, no doubt, very much pressed with this "dogmatic statement," but he dismisses it in a few words. His mind is clearly of that class which runs riot in its intellectual power, and will have nothing to be a hindrance to its own conclusions. This pride of reason is the great snare and pit-fall of our time; and, as we have an old and very sincere regard for Mr. Mozley, we are very sorry that he has not "overcome" the temptation.

Well, then, Mr. Mozley, after enumerating certain non-natural ways in which various religionists may, "with perfect honesty, accept and subscribe" this "dogmatic statement" of the Church of England, though they have little or nothing in common with the Church of England, and know all the time that they "accept and subscribe" not in the sense in which it was conceived and (p. 217) is imposed, proceeds to say—

"This statement speaks of a certain class of baptized infants, viz. those who die before they commit actual sin, and what it asserts is limited to them: it does not speak of all infants."

Really, this passes—it is a little too bad. Mr. Mozley knows very well that it is precisely *because* the Church is "certain by God's Word" that *all* infants are regenerate in and by their baptism, that she is able to give the comforting assurance that "children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." That the statement is thus, in its first and simple intention, exactly that universal affirmative proposition which he denies it to be.

We need not pursue our ungrateful task. We have said enough to make out our case, that this book is not trustworthy, even when considered apart from the general issue of its argument. It is very sad to see—but it is a merciful warning—how the finest mind is warped and distorted when it relies upon itself in matters of religion, and puts "private interpretation" of Scripture in the place of the Catholic Faith.

Bulwerism.*



THE critic of BULWER must take heed how he lets the wind get between him and the nobility of his subject. He must handle his subject daintily, and delicately, as he would *Sèvres* china, or any piece of skilful and rare mechanism; or, as delightful old Isaac Walton warns us when about to insert a

* 1. *A Strange Story*. By Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Bart., M.P., author of *Rienzi*, &c. &c. 1861.

2. *The Collected Works of Sir E. B. Lytton*, in 20 vols.

hook into a frog, do it tenderly as though we loved him. This amount of care and respect our author demands, and this we willingly accord to him, merely regarded as an artist of amazing fertility of fancy, marvellous industry, and in neatness as a painter almost unrivalled. If popularity, too, be taken as a test of skill, the success of Sir Edward, as a mere writer of romances, is beyond all dispute. His books have probably sold on both sides of the Atlantic readily enough to satisfy the very hungriest of publishers, and in some measure to appease the author's own thirst for literary fame. Whether the delighted thousands who have bought and read these romances have gathered from them the broad and healthy lessons which such books should teach, which to some degree the author professes to offer them, or whether they have not too often spent their toil "on that which is not bread," is another and very different question, which we propose to try in some measure to solve.

The first thing which strikes us, on glancing over this goodly row of volumes, is that, on the whole, in some most important points, the later stories are superior to their predecessors. It cannot be said of their author, as it has been said of more than one able writer of fiction, that "he went up like a rocket, and came down like the stick." As a mere piece of workmanship *The Caxtons* excels *Ernest Maltravers* by some miles of evident superiority, both in point of execution and of moral tone. And this is only what we should expect of a man who has won his laurels as a statesman, an orator, and a writer of romance. To add fresh leaves to the laurel of that crown has been his highest ambition, and his most unwearied study. He has done his very best; and of this the reader is ever conscious. He feels that he is reading the careful writing of a most careful artist who is never slovenly, never thoughtless; who never puts a single touch of colour on the most finished picture without a specific meaning; it may be for mere effect, to please the reader, to annoy him, to distract his attention, or to confuse him,—but in any case for a clear, definite purpose, legitimate or illegitimate. This is one sign of true art; but it is only one; and not the highest. *Ars est celare artem*. This incessant care, continual polish, and unbroken smoothness, instead of concealing the art reveal it. The effect on the reader is to make him think of varnish, japan; landscapes of *papier mâché*, men and women on painted enamel, boys and girls, saints and sinners, ladies and gentlemen, rogues and philosophers, got up to perfection, and ready at a moment's notice to step out in front of the footlights, and begin the play. There is no vulgar smell of gas, or oranges, rosin, or tobacco; the very fiddles are in tune; every fiddler is a Paganini in embryo, and has a white *mouchoir* in his breast-pocket. The ruffian who murders his uncle in the second act is amiable and refined, much given to the study of philosophy, a linguist, a musician, a diplomatist in his way,—but, unfortunately for society, he has a hankering after other people's guineas. His classical knowledge has not taught him the exact difference between *meum* and *tuum*, and so it is haplessly left to Mr. J. Ketch to finish his education.

Provided the reader likes tragical comedy, and has "a taste for genteel breeding," nothing can be better of its kind than this. It is, probably, as good as *Art* can make it; but, when we ask what *Nature* has had to do with the picture, we must alter our tone. If these were merely stories meant to be acted on the stage, so far as stage-effects go—to all those who delight in "sensation" scenes, people, and things—nothing could be better. But the misfortune is that they are meant to be pictures of everyday life, that life which is about us in the world, the men and women who eat and drink, sleep and waken, live and die, sin and suffer, rise and fall, as we do—of the same flesh and blood with ourselves; and *this*, as we read, we feel they are *not*. If we take up a volume of SHAKESPEARE, the men and women—soldiers, statesmen, saints, heroines, and sinners, clowns, and philosophers—of every age and every land—all strike us as essentially human, and not belonging to the stage at all. There are the people we

know, and feel to be our own kith and kin. But, in the characters now before us, the first thing that springs from the picture is the thought how well they would look on the stage. All is arranged so neatly and so aptly; the gravity, the humour, the poetry, the sentiment, the vulgarity (which is always of the most gentlemanly kind), come in so exactly at the right place, that the skill of the artist is apparent, and is felt. We are sure that every scene would tell, and the audience would be carried away in a *furor* of excitement and gratified admiration.

Let us open a volume, and see how its contents answer for themselves. The story is too long and too well-known to need an entire analysis. We must take the scenes which first come to hand. Thus it opens:—

Ernest Maltravers, the hero, loses his way at midnight near a wide and desolate common, in England, and at last knocks at the door of a hovel, and asks for shelter and guidance. The inmates of the cottage are two; one a man of fifty, a hardened ruffian, with the gallows stamped on his face; the other a girl of fifteen—*Alice*—with noble blue eyes, the fairest cheek, and most dainty of blushes. The ruffian persuades the stranger to rest there all night, that he may rob and murder him. *Alice*, after secretly pleading in vain with her father, gives the handsome traveller timely notice of his danger, and helps him to escape. He *does* escape; and, within an hour, so does *Alice*, from the brutal parent who only cursed and ill-used her. She flies for her life, and, within another hour or two, again meets the young traveller, who pities her, listens to her sad story, makes an appointment for a second meeting, and having—as all such heroes ought to have—plenty of time and money at command, keeps his appointment in the dusk of the evening, in a country lane. His heart beats at her approach, though he had formed no plan of conduct, and meant no harm. His first words to her are—"Sweet girl, how well this light becomes you! How shall I thank you for not forgetting me?"

She surrenders her hand without a struggle; tells all her sad story, of her own peril, and his escape from the ruffian; and, in answer to his questions, says that she can neither read nor write, and has never learned her Catechism, never said her prayers, and is ignorant of the meaning of the word God. Of course, she has never been to church—where, she thinks, "one man talks nonsense, and the other folk listen to him;" and is altogether in a very unhappy and miserable state of being. The hero is at a loss what to do with the hapless maiden, but at last compels her to say what she would like herself. Her unsophisticated answer is, "*I should like to live with you, sir.*" To this, after a word or two of explanation, and a caution of, "*Alice, we must not fall in love with each other,*" he agrees. He is "a spoiled child, with no law but his own fancy;" and at once hires a cottage, with lawns, conservatories, and rose-clad verandahs, and an old woman to cook and do the work. There the two are to live, as master and disciple; he studying German metaphysics, Plato, Shakespeare, Schiller, music, and a meerschaum; she her letters, A, B, C, as well as pot-hooks and hangers. He hires a writing-master for her—old and ugly, but skilful in calligraphy. She gradually improves; in a week learns to sing, to dress better, to kiss his hand in gratitude, and to improve in grammar and in accent; he, all the while, "being already up to his ears in the moon-lit abyss of Plato, and had filled a dozen common-place books with criticisms on Kant."

Within a very short period he is hopelessly in love with her, and confesses his passion, which is rapturously returned. They are one for ever. Their cottage at once breathes "the poetry of home." She has now not only mastered her letters, but can talk with him of *Eros* and *Psyche*, and "the Greeks who made love a god. Were they wicked for it?"

There is no need, nor have we space, to complete the outline of this picture; because this fragment is more than sufficient for our purpose. One sentence must tell the rest. The death of his father separates the two lovers; she is carried off by her father, the ruffian, who comes to

rob the house; the hero goes abroad; loves more madly than ever; comes back to England after a hundred pages of small print; again falls madly in love; his next victim is suddenly snatched from him by death; and the story abruptly concludes, without *Alice's* reappearance, in these words:—

"Go alone, O Maltravers, unfriended, remote—thy present a waste, and thy past life a ruin, go forth to the future! Human life is compared to the circle. Is the simile just? All lines that are drawn from the centre to touch the circumference, by the law of the circle are equal. But the lines that are drawn from the heart of the man to the verge of his destiny, do they equal each other? Alas! some seem so brief, and some lengthen on as for ever."

(Neither more nor less than a piece of incomprehensible bathos.)

Now, as to the broad morality of this story, the less said the better. We might have selected other volumes in which the same utter laxity prevails, as well as some which are free from such a stain. Our main purpose now is to see how far the picture is true to life. Art has done everything for it—as it has for the continuation of the story in *Alice*, or *The Mysteries*—what has Nature done? We answer, boldly, *little or nothing*. Granted that such persons exist, that such things are done and said under such and such circumstances, and the picture drawn is perfect; it is as life-like as if we saw it acted on the stage, heard the words, and beheld the actors. But we assert that such persons, words, and things as are here drawn are wholly removed from the sphere of reality. They are unreal, and untrue, and contradictory. 1. No high-born English gentleman, a scholar, a poet, a musician, and a philosopher, would at once fall madly in love with *Bill Sykes'* daughter, unless *he knew something more of her than that she was ignorant of her letters, and of the name of God; and at the word vice said, "Anan, sir?"* 2. Many a profligate would regard such a girl as his lawful prey. But *Maltravers* is drawn, not as a profligate, but a man of honour, feeling, and truth. To him, therefore, a well-bred, moral, educated man, ignorance, vulgarity of manner and speech offer no attraction. 3. But *Alice* is as guileless, innocent, and pure, as she is ignorant; having learned innocence in the den of a burglar, and from the infamous proposals of one of his companions. She shows her maiden bashfulness by calmly proposing to live with the first handsome man she happens to meet in a country lane. 4. This charms the hero into instant and consuming love. His admiration for so much guilelessness, innocence, and refinement is accounted for by the fact that he "once shut himself up for months to study astrology, and had even been suspected of a serious hunt after the philosopher's stone;" that he had once joined in a frantic conspiracy of young German republicans, &c. &c. All of which reasons have as much to do with the matter in hand as the fact of his having red hair, or being a member of Parliament. 5. It takes more than a month—not to say some years—to pass from utter ignorance of the alphabet to be able to talk, or to understand any one who talks, about *Eros* and *Psyche*, and the Greeks who made love into a god. 6. Between such a girl as *Alice*, and such a man as *Ernest Maltravers*, though living in a rose-clad cottage, there could be no such sympathy as is here drawn. Between him studying the depths of Plato, Kant, Schiller, and soaring to the heights of philosophy, and the daughter of a common tramp, who scarcely knows her own name, and is as ignorant as a child of seven years, is a gulf not to be crossed easily, and in a few days, far less instantly and at once, unless he is smitten *only* by the charms of her person, which we are told he is *not*. A bold and coarse profligate would have acted as he did, deliberately planned and carried out the ruin of his victim; but *Maltravers* is painted as no such villain; and neither his part nor her part in the fall is spoken of as more than a serious, but natural "indiscretion, *he had done wrong it is true, but,*" &c. &c. This, we repeat, is unreal and contradictory. If neither a profligate, nor smitten with her beauty of face, he could not have acted as he is here drawn. While, if indeed a student of Plato, and a seeker for wisdom in her

noblest and purest heights, he could have found nothing to attract him in the raw ignorance of a country bumpkin; so that in either case there would have been between them an impassable barrier. 7. The same laxity which here glosses over *sin*, and treats it as a mere wrong, falls into an equally fatal mistake when the life which the two are leading is described as full of "the poetry of *home*." A man living for a few weeks, with a woman whom he has ruined, in a hired cottage—even at fifty guineas a week—has no right to the word *HOME*, far too sacred a thing to be thus degraded and debased. Home is a place where love of the highest, purest, noblest kind has taken root, grown up, and borne the goodly fruit which God meant it to bear in the hearts and the lives of all there, whether amidst the affluence of wealth or the trials of poverty. It has nothing to do with "fragrant Salonica in amber-tipped meerschams," "foreign creepers," or "breathless moonlight," "banks of violets," or "golden ringlets of the dawn." The *poetry* of home is to be found only in home itself; and *not* in the presence of a woman who is said to have "purchased modesty, delicacy of thought and soul, in the sacrifice of herself." This is a purchase in which we have not the slightest ground for belief. Many such a purchase may be *assumed*, but the buyer can only reap one result, the unalterable wages of sin, death of modesty, of delicacy, and of all that crowns woman with her highest beauty. If it were not so, men would gather grapes of thorns and figs of thistles.

Moreover, in this case, no such purchase was needed. For, before her fall, she is described—

"As fair, as chaste, as pure in body and in mind
As snow unsullied."

Purity once lost is not regained by one swift stride—and that one on the wrong road.

We have taken the trouble to analyse this fragment of one of these romances, because the same unreality and want of truthfulness more or less underlies them all. The highest art lies in giving us pictures of life as it is, not of life as it is not, and never can be. Granted that these men and women could ever have thought, felt, acted, and spoke, as they here speak, think, feel, and act, and the picture is perfect. But the misfortune is that, supposing the *circumstances* possible, the speeches, thoughts, and actions are so unreal, and so unlife-like as to be morally impossible. The whole scene is brought before us with infinite skill and power; but when we come to handle it, it crumbles to pieces. A man, after five-and-twenty, rarely reads such a book a second time, whether it offer to him a picture out of the cloudy past called an historical novel, or such an extravagant medley as the *Strange Story*, with all its mixture of pretended philosophy, imposture, and supernatural delusions and ecstatic love-making.

The consequence of this great UNREALITY is that our author never touches his readers' hearts. He rouses their curiosity, excites their interest, stimulates their fiercest thirst for scenes of adventure, intrigue, and peril; gives them glimpses of the land where passion, of the deepest and darkest, and worst kind, or of the brightest and best kind, not only thrive and grow, but grow with all the fervour and brilliancy which becomes the wand of so potent a magician. He carries them along the edge of precipices, and points to hidden gulfs, moral, mental and philosophical, but he never does more than indicate their existence. He lays down no chart of the perilous heights, or of the fatal depths below. No future traveller will ever be the better for having taken that journey or that soaring flight. The guide is continually hinting to us of hidden meanings and profound truths that underlie his story; but when we come to the story itself it is impossible to understand how much is true and how much untrue; how much he himself believes, or how much he holds in utter contempt. All is vague, cloudy, indistinct; not because we have reached the true region of cloudland, for we still feel that our guide is of the earth, earthly, and that we are treading the earth,—but because the vision in the guide's mind is neither clear nor distinct; and he can but offer us what he himself sees. And from him and what *he* sees, feels, and

thinks, we never escape. Whether it be nominally *Eugene Aram*, *Riccabocca*,—inimitable *Riccabocca*,—*Maltravers*, *Paul Clifford*, or *Pisistratus Caxton*,—the young poet, the aged warrior, the wayside pedlar, the crowned monarch, or the painted beauty,—never for an instant do we escape the presence of Sir E. B. Bulwer Lytton. We are convinced that, if we could but strip off the disguise, we should infallibly discover our *quondam* guide, moralist, friend, philosopher, king, tinker, bard, or statesman. This is, of course, so far a proof of his exceeding cleverness and dexterity; but it wearies us who read. We want to meet a Mr. Jones or a Smith in ordinary life who does *not* talk and act *stagey*; who does *not* say “he has passed the meridian meal,” but “has had his dinner;” and an *Alonzo* who “puts on his clothes” instead of “donning his attire;” a man who can smoke his pipe without describing “the gilt pastile which not too healthily adulterates the seductive weed, with odours that gratify the repugnant censure of the fastidious;” a father that can chat as well as *Caxton* after dinner about the *Drama* without stopping to inform us that drama is from a Greek word signifying “to do;”—or who, to show his extensive reading, makes that father address his boy as—“O planeticose and exallotriote spirit (from *πλανήτικος*, and *ἐξαλλοτριώω*), disposed to roam, and to alienate, &c.” Such phrases belong to pedantry and affectation; and these are not among the qualifications of a great author. We want some one to get out of himself and take us with him; and this our author never does. He is always clever, often humorous, sometimes wise; but he never seems to write without effort, or without saying to the reader, “Now, prepare, I am about to become poetical, philosophic, transcendental; I’m going to moralize like Sterne, to make speeches, *more Attico*, to unfold the world of mystery, mesmerism, or Mormonism; the secrets of Cagliostro, or of modern humbug; the divinity of Shakespeare, or the earthliness of Muggins.” We admire the greatness of the Art, but we crave a little more Nature; the mysterious height of the philosophy, the learning of the poetry, the correctness of the speculations, but we ask for a little more quiet simplicity, naturalness, and ease. Walking on stilts is a great gift, where it is well done; walking well on one’s feet is far greater. In a writer of romance, we want some one to take us by the hand and kindly lead us away to a quiet, steady look at a picture of human life, neither exaggerated, nor distorted,—but speaking in true, living voice of all life’s sorrows, sins, cares, and joys; of the things that have made men and women *truly* great or infamous, hateful or a blessing for ever; of the sunshine and the shade, as He orders who governs the earth; of the tares and the wheat, as He suffers them to grow till the harvest. And this picture, Bulwer, in spite of all his skill, dexterity, learning, and industry, does not offer us. Probably he never will.

We have, indeed, a succession of pictures from life, infinite in variety, well-chosen in subject, and painted with great skill: but we must not examine them too closely; we must not come too near; or we shall detect all the artifice, the wires, the padding, the rouge, the false-hair, the paste. It is not real life that we see; the trees are pasteboard, the moonlight is sham; the distant mountains are only twenty feet off from the gasping poet who is writing a sonnet on their crown of eternal snow; but it is the best imitation of life, of trees, moonlight, mountains, poetry, and philosophy, that we shall find in a long day’s march. If all Bulwer’s novels are essentially melodramatic, and partake of all the unreality which belongs to melodrama, they are at least admirable of their kind. In his own field he has few competitors and no rival. The *Lady of Lyons*, with its slight, sparkling dialogue, its humour, and vivacity, stands almost alone among modern comediettas. If we have omitted to particularize his special excellences as a writer, it is because there is no need to say what all the world knows. If he tells us more of the surface than the true inner life of men and things, we must be glad that it is no worse. *Non omnia possumus omnes*.

Patterson on History and Art.*



R. PATTERSON, the author of the volume before us, has long been well known in the world of journalism as an accomplished and elegant writer. The present collection of essays testifies to the justice of such a representation, and displays moreover the wide range of his knowledge and the superiority of his judgment. His previous work upon the Napoleonic policy in Europe, though a masterpiece of acute reasoning and a model for the writing of a political tractate, gave his readers no reason to suspect the knowledge possessed by the author in æsthetics, as well as in the less-known fields of history. Mr. Patterson may serve as an illustration of a theory that we are strongly inclined to maintain, namely, that the soundest political knowledge is most likely to exist in conjunction with a refined taste and a broad general culture. The more extensive a man’s knowledge of theoretical principles of art, and of the abstract tendencies of human nature, the more deeply laid will be the conclusions at which he arrives in the practical art of politics. A doctrinaire is commonly considered the most dangerous person to whom to entrust any post of administration, and the liveliest alarm is felt when a statesman chiefly known as a theorist receives the charge of an important political department. But this prevalent dislike seems to arise from a misconception of what a theorist may be and indeed legitimately is. The ordinary English notion is that every one who holds a theory clings to it without modification or balance; that, in his eagerness to carry out his doctrine, he disdains all compromise, and refuses to make any allowance for extenuating circumstances. This may be a true account of the foolish theorist, but it is surely as wrong to judge of this class by such abnormal specimens as it would be to form one’s opinion of English morality from an inspection of the law reports. The theorist from whom we may derive more substantial advantage than from most so-called practical men is one who, like the mechanic, is familiar with the abstract laws of things, but knows at the same time how to estimate the disturbance occasioned by the friction of the ropes and other interfering influences. Mr. Patterson’s political essays in the present volume, coupled with the former work to which we have referred, may serve to show that the highest political sagacity is perfectly compatible with, and, as we think, in its best form, inseparable from, the widest general cultivation. For example, in the *Essay on our Indian Empire*, the expediency of two measures is urgently advocated, the concession of the long-withheld right of buying the land in India out and out, and also of redeeming the land-tax; and we are told that while the sheets of the essay especially advocating these reforms were passing through the press the Governor-general issued the edict which conceded them. Mr. Patterson’s views moreover upon the best, if not the only, means of ever civilizing and evangelizing India, show that a knowledge of the first principles of human nature is the best guarantee for clearness of political insight, as distinguished from the mere vulpine acuteness of an empiric.

The historical essays before us embrace a tolerably wide variety of subjects from the very broad topic of the ethnology of Europe to the castes and creeds of India, national life in China, and the records of Nineveh and Babylon. We may say of all that they are written with taste and scholarly breadth, and that the author has imparted an interest to themes that seemed before to be almost incapable of it. China, for instance, is a name redolent in itself of everything dull, vague, and profoundly unsatisfactory, and we are at first disposed to expect as much from a dissertation on national life in China as from the memorable chapter on the snakes in Iceland. But we are speedily undeceived. Mr. Patterson has pre-

* *Essays in History and Art*. By R. H. Patterson. William Blackwood and Sons.

sented a novel and vivid picture of life in that huge and mysterious empire, and has shown that instead of being, as we are wont to imagine, the scene of drowsy despotism, it is constantly seething in revolt and national uprisings. We may notice, by the way, that the pleasure we feel in perusing this most interesting essay is somewhat marred by the want of care displayed in its arrangement. The author tells us in the preface that it contains the substance of three distinct essays which have been cast into one; but this process should have been performed with more attention than appears to have been bestowed upon it, for at p. 270 we read thus:—

“But it is the abuses of power only against which the people protest on such occasions, not its form. They admire and venerate with their whole heart the governmental system of their country, which is not only an elaborate machine associated with their entire past history, but which adapts itself admirably to the national spirit. It is no mere theoretical constitution which has been struck off at a blow, such as have been lately so much in vogue in Europe; it is a perfect embodiment of the Chinese predilection in government, and has grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength of the people.”

What is our surprise some twelve pages further on to find ourselves once more admiring this well-written passage, which is repeated at p. 282, *verbatim*, from “it is only the abuses of power” down to “grown with the growth, and strengthened with the strength of the people.” In other portions of this and the *Essay on our Indian Empire*, which has also been cast out of a number of others, we are haunted by the idea that we have read this or something like it very recently. Among curious errors we may rank as not the least curious the following astounding rendering of a well-known sentence:—*Malum cum Platone errare quam desipere aliis!* which is the precise contrary of what Cicero said, the true phrase being, as everybody knows, *Cum Platone errare malo, quam cum istis vera sentire*. It is also to be lamented that Mr. Patterson should have permitted such a mistake as *crème du crime* to remain uncorrected; it will sound as stupid to a Frenchman as “Sir Peel” does to ourselves. That these are no more than slips of the pen is true; but still to a scholar they are blemishes, all the more unpleasant because so easy to be avoided.

The essays that we least like in the collection are those shorter ones which can be said to belong strictly neither to history nor art; those, we mean, entitled *Utopias*, *Youth and Summer*, *Genius and Liberty*. They are of the unsatisfactory kind which leads to nothing; and though they may display a graceful style, and abound in pleasant imagery, it seems a pity that a writer of Mr. Patterson's power should waste it on these “trifles light as air.” In *Genius and Liberty* he has, in our opinion, treated a profound subject in the style least of all suited to it; and where there was room for the useful display of his wide knowledge, and powers of speculative inquiry, he has given us no more than a light sketch, such as might have come from the pen of A. K. H. B., or any other jaunty philosopher. With all respect for Mr. Patterson, we would submit that he has scarcely fathomed the question of the relation between genius and liberty. “Sunshine,” he says, “is not more needful to the flower than liberty is to the growth of genius.” Now, this is either far too broad a proposition, or else we must take the terms genius and liberty with restrictions not implied in their ordinary acceptation. Mr. Patterson cannot mean political liberty, for, alike in France and in our own country, some of the finest monuments of genius were produced under the severest despotism. Take Molière, who was a writer of unquestioned genius, and yet you find that he was forced to write to order. *Le roi le veut* was the principal source of his inspiration. Corneille, and Lulli, the father of French music, both flourished under the most absolute of despotisms. The golden age of Elizabeth in England could scarcely be characterized as throwing the sunshine of liberty upon the nascent flower of genius. The fact would seem to be that certain developments of genius cannot be found except in conjunction with free-

dom. Lyric poetry, for example, and possibly some of the highest aspirations of the painter and the sculptor, could only find their noblest expansion in an atmosphere of unbounded liberty; but the genius of the statesman, the dramatist, or the historian, would not appear to be fettered with such conditions.

We gain a very different idea of Mr. Patterson's power of treating a subject profoundly, and in a manner exhaustively, from the excellent *Essay on Real and Ideal Beauty*. In this he assails the association theory of beauty first broached by Alison, and afterwards expanded by Lord Jeffrey into the broad doctrine that all beauty consists in the power of recalling or reflecting agreeable or interesting sensations, with which we have been made familiar by the direct and intelligible agency of our common sensibilities. Just as Helvetius maintained that memory is no more than weakened sensation, so Jeffrey and his school held that beauty is no more than reflected sensation. This theory, stamped as it is with the base mark of the basest portion of the thought of the eighteenth century, finds no favour with an imaginative thinker of the *à priori* school, like Mr. Patterson. That association has great power in colouring our sense of what is beautiful, he is prepared unequivocally to acknowledge; but this fact, he urges, no more disproves the existence of an æsthetic instinct—an innate faculty for recognizing the truly and abstractedly beautiful—than the fact that conscience is subject to modification from the passions and affections demonstrates the impossibility of the existence of a moral sense. We have not space here to follow Mr. Patterson through his very elaborate argumentation. We are, in fact, in presence of the never-ending controversy, which assumes such an infinite variety of forms, and affects such an infinite variety of subjects, that, namely, between the sensational and the ideal philosophies. We cannot refrain from quoting the author's masterly summing up of his own view:—

“There is a harmony between the constitution of man and that of nature; the qualities of the one suit the phenomena of the other; and whatever is most perfect (*i. e.* beautiful) in the outer world excites the most perfect and delightful emotions in the soul of man. . . . The beautiful, in short, instead of being, as the associationists affirm, merely a chameleon-like phantom, having no definite basis either in the soul of man or the nature of God, is a gleaming forth throughout all creation of the *specialty* DIVINE, whether in the form of nature, the acts of man, or the emotions of mind.”

The whole tone and style of treatment adopted in this admirable Essay makes us regret that Mr. Patterson has not devoted himself to the production of a distinct work upon the same subject. Æsthetics, or the science whose end is the beautiful, is little studied in this country, and principally for want of some compact treatise from which its elements could be learned. The diffusion of such knowledge, even in a merely elementary degree, would add manifoldly to the sum of rational human happiness; and this is more particularly desirable in an age of which it has been said:—

“The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending we lay waste our powers;
Little we see in nature that is ours,
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon.”

Not the least evil of the enormous amount of contemporary periodical literature is that it tempts to mere ephemeral efforts writers who might produce something that the world would long prize. In this number we may count the author of the volume before us, who, we trust, will appreciate our suggestion.

Thomas Hood.*



WE do not suppose that the over-reverence of any son for his own father is a particularly general sign of the times; nor are we certainly at all disposed to try to make any conspicuously tender estimate appear ridiculous. But Mr.

* *The Works of Thomas Hood, edited by his Son, Comic and Serious, in Prose and Verse.* London: Moxon.

Thomas Hood the younger obliges us to say that, whilst we have nothing but praise for his affection, we cannot get over the accumulated evidences of his bad taste. He appears to have been a very good son indeed; but he—with excellent intentions—puts his father's memory to extraordinary and grievous peril. Of all the "edited" books that ever came before us this is certainly about the worst. It has not been permitted those outside Mr. Hood's circle to know how far this publication is consistent with any wishes ever expressed by his father; but the name of Thomas Hood is on the whole too well treasured by Englishmen to make the remarkable mistake involved in the issue of this edition one to be at all lightly condemned. We are not to be taken to be finding any sort of fault with the very rational purpose of giving to the world any edition of the collected works of a very favourite writer; but the services of the editor are emphatically so mischievous, whilst they are meant to be so fond, that we are surprised the friends of the poet can refrain themselves from interfering, or from at least combining in some decisive protest. We are inclined to believe that the office Mr. Hood the younger has rushed into is about the most difficult and delicate that can come into any man's hands. If the author of *The Song of a Shirt* left his instructions, and his son in these volumes has not exceeded them, we have simply nothing more to say; but it is inconceivable that he ever meant so to murder his own memory. It is scarcely too much to declare that no man who ever lived could afford to publish to the world all that he ever wrote. And this is exactly what Mr. Hood the younger, under some sort of seizure, seems to have done.

He appears to have fancied—and still to fancy, for, unhappily, there is more to come—that the commission to collect his father's writings, "comic and serious, in prose and verse," gave him authority to drag before the world, indiscriminately, everything that ever came from his father's pen. We have no hesitation in saying that this is a trial to which no parent should be put by his offspring. No one ever believed that the poet Hood, any more than any other poet, was at all times equal, or that everything he wrote was fit to be bound up in all kinds of series. No one wanted to be reminded that even the high-souled man, whom everybody seemed to fancy they knew as a friend, had his weak moments; but his son seems determined that they shall be helped to the reflection. The whole matter is really a very serious one. We, none of us, know that some of the same awkward zeal may not be waiting to fall upon our papers after our removal; and it may be that very many of us will not be so well able to bear it as the late Thomas Hood. We, most of us, leave behind some written folly that we wish to be forgotten; but no one is safe if they are to turn up against us in a "collected" form after we are gone. Mr. Hood the younger is clearly too devoted a son to allow of any one criticising his motives—but he is about the only enemy of his father's memory that we ever heard of. And all this is so much the more to be deprecated because the idea of giving a collected edition of the works of such a thoroughly home-poet was so entirely a good one. We never in our experience saw anything so spoiled in its execution. No one who cares to continue to think well of Thomas Hood should get this series. They will stumble upon something to upset their ideal at every page; and it is quite time that people should know the value of the mixture they are invited to buy. A man is not the less entitled to stand well because he does not always write for posterity. It may be conceived that Thomas Hood, when he sat down at the end of a long day to rhyme, or to write about some trifle only dear to him or his, did not expect to find it introduced to the world in his "collected works." If, in communion with the past, he wrote on the birthday of his wife, or, it might be, the death of some missed one only known within his circle, something should have told his editorial son that such sacred things were never meant to meet the public eye. This is just the hard position, however, in which the son has put the father. He asks us to read that which it is not fit we should criticise; and that

which we may not like we are reminded we must read with the recollection that it was never meant we should see it. This is fair to no one concerned. It is not fair to the public. It is not prudent in the editor; and it is nothing less than disastrous to the memory of the poet whom not even this collection will prevent us all from always honouring. We do not intend, we may say at once, to make this *Review* the medium of publishing to the world any of those trifles which we are so very sure the poet himself never meant should appear. We should not have noticed the edition at all, but that we desired to protest against it, and all of its class. Poor Thomas Hood had a heart that melted at the little sorrows that crowd into the existence of those whom the world calls happy; and we can well believe how pleasant, to those who sat round his hearth, these bursts of humour or of agony must have been. But when a man writes a sarcasm against the tooth-ache, or a sonnet on a goldfinch, or apostrophises his neighbour's cat, or puts into verse the history of the ravages of the influenza in the next street—a particular and a local purpose is served, and should be confined, we contend, to a local audience. Many of these snatches of real poetry, it is true enough, show what the man was as well as do some of his more pretentious poems; but then the editor's qualification should have been shown in his judgment in their selection; and in no sort of degree does this qualification appear to belong to the younger Mr. Hood. He cannot, however, complain that all his efforts to make for himself a name since his father's death have met with the most marked indulgence. The public received him as his father's son—criticism suspended many of its functions when it was recollected whose name he bore. He had been brought up, we believe, at the London University; an unpromising beginning, which was to some extent neutralized by his entrance at Oxford. His first work was received with that favour which it must have been clear to him was not unconnected with the nation's living recollection of his father. And the welcome given to his *Pen and Pencil Sketches*, which showed very considerable promise, but had scarcely a touch about them of his poet-parent, should have encouraged him to tread in those steps that had left their mark. But, with the exception of the unfortunate association of his name with this "collected" edition, he seems on all occasions when he has been heard of to be very far out of his father's track. He has, indeed, always been writing, but not even in the best magazines, and every fresh effort has brought him to a lower level. The publication of his *Daughters of King Daher* satisfied those who saw it that the father certainly did not live again in the son. There was poetry in it here and there; but he seems to have himself discovered its general weakness, and to have determined to make the distance between Thomas Hood and himself into a gaping gulf; and he is next heard of as a contributor to a cheap and pointless sort of *charivari*. The position of Mr. Thomas Hood the younger as one of the Bohemians of the great city would be no affair of ours, and would concern no one but himself, if he did not happen to bear his honoured father's name. But by the course he has taken he has practically implied that he does not want sympathy, and that he only asks for the public pence to buy his penny paper. It is not a good thing to see a young man, who began with a troop of friends, throwing his chance away, and conceiving personal third-rate *facéties* at so much a column, or telling the world how entirely he hates Mr. Disraeli. His life opened up with some extraordinary influences for good about him—a happy home, and Mrs. S. C. Hall's regards. We can only say we are sincerely troubled about the publication of this "collected" edition. We hope it may never be completed. To throw it aside is the only reparation that Mr. Thomas Hood the younger can offer to his father's memory for his share in this affectionate and, we would believe, unconscious impropriety.

The South Vindicated.*

HAD this work appeared before the volumes of Mr. Spence and Professor Cames it would possibly have taken a higher rank in the literature of the American controversy than it will now.

It is not a mere party pamphlet. It does attempt to deal with facts. And a certain proportion of its contents is effective and original. But Mr. Williams will, we fear, have set people against his views, even when just and cogent, by his unfortunate attempt to couple with the vindication of the South a positive defence of slavery. The most that can be said for slavery is that, for the present, it is a necessary evil. To go beyond this, and contend for its intrinsic goodness, is going further than the warmest friends of the South in England will be disposed to follow. And Mr. Williams, therefore, ought not to be disappointed if he finds the effect of his book on the British public something much less than he had anticipated. We must remember, of course, that these letters were addressed, in the first instance, to an American, and not a British audience; to sympathizers, not critics. But, though this may absolve the writer of them from the charge of injudiciousness, it does not, as we need hardly say, add anything to the strength of his argument.

Mr. Williams, like the majority of advocates, is stronger in attack than in defence. The Northern target has plenty of weak places in it, and Mr. Williams has left half-a-dozen shot-holes in these, which testify both to his knowledge of the subject, and the correctness of his aim. The anti-slavery cry in the North, says he, is kept up by one-third ignorance, and two-thirds disguised selfishness. The only party in the North which is sincere in its abolitionist opinions knows nothing at all about the matter. The only parties who know anything at all about the matter are not sincere. We have first of all the literary and sentimental class, represented and appealed to by Mrs. Beecher Stowe. These, it is said, draw their whole inspiration from English literature, and adopt the abolitionist opinions which colour this, just as they take in literary, social, or artistic ones; but they have as little practical acquaintance with the institution of slavery as their English models. They never visit the Southern States; never inspect a plantation; never, in fact, make the slightest effort to move outside the circle of prejudices and traditions within which they live, as dead and as blind to the realities which exist outside of it, as people in a dream. In the second place we have the Northern manufacturers, who make use of the anti-slavery sentiment for their own purposes; wishing to keep the South in subjection for the purpose of maintaining a tariff that shall cause half the profits of the slave-owners to flow into their own coffers. These men, it is obvious, do not wish slavery to be abolished. But having used the abolitionists to crush the South, they would next use the South to silence the abolitionists. Thirdly, we have the political anti-Southerners, men actuated by a creed which is everywhere busily at work at the present day, as well as in the Northern States. The object against which the hostility of this party is virtually directed is not slavery but aristocracy. They wish to abolish gentlemen; and, therefore, to humiliate the South. It is the same sentiment as that which prompts our own Radicals. Many a man has voted for Reform Bills, and Burial Bills, and Primogeniture Bills, not because he cared twopence about popular rights, or liberty of conscience, or the division of land, but because he knew that by voting on this side he was voting against bishops, and gentlemen, and culture, and all the traditions and sentiments of an aristocracy. Nor do we question but that some of that sympathy with the North which distinguishes a certain section of the English Liberals is trace-

* *The South Vindicated: being a Series of Letters written for the American Press during the canvass for the Presidency in 1860, with a Letter to Lord Brougham on the John Brown Raid, and a Survey of the Result of the Presidential Contest, and its Consequences.* By the Hon. James Williams, late American Minister to Turkey. With an Introduction by John Baker Hopkins. London: Longman.

able to the same source; to a well-founded belief, that is, that the cause of the North is in reality the cause of democracy, notwithstanding that an exceptional situation may appear to throw doubt on the relationship. Not that it really does; for modern democracy is a vastly different thing from ancient, and may be severed from freedom without its essence being touched. The Northern States, also, have their Brights, and their Baineses; and these form another considerable pillar of the anti-slavery imposture.

Up to this point we have little difficulty in agreeing, substantially, with Mr. Williams. No doubt there may be a great deal of hypocrisy, and some ignorance, in the virtuous indignation of the North; but when he goes further than this, and seeks to prove the absolute excellences of slavery, he assumes a task beyond his strength. We must mention, by the way, that his expurgation of slavery from the practical charges brought against it does not meet the real objections which people in England entertain. To an English mind the atrocities of a *Légitime* are an aggravation of the evil, but they do not constitute the evil. Were everything of the kind proved to be mere romance to-morrow, the fundamental objection to the system would be left exactly where it was. If slavery be not contrary both to the law of God and the law of nature, the abuses of slavery would justify reform, not abolition. If it be contrary, the disproof of these abuses cannot justify its continuance. This part of Mr. Williams's book, then, is lost labour, except in connection with other parts to which we cannot for a moment listen; those, namely, which seek to show that slavery is *not* contrary to the laws of God and nature. We know that among English writers and thinkers, who are on principle opposed to slavery, some may be found who take the same view of Scripture language. Mr. Stirling, for instance, in his very able *Letters from the Slave States* (1859), recommends abolitionists to abandon the Scriptural argument. But may we not say that upon this, as upon other great questions, an example was intended to be set of the way in which all reforms should be accomplished? A variety of precepts antagonistic to the ideas and practices of the heathen world are introduced into the Bible with caution, and even ambiguity. It was left for mankind to interpret particular passages by the general spirit of the whole system; and when they do not choose to do so, it is often not difficult to find excuses for any course of conduct they may desire. Slavery, therefore, an existing institution of paganism, which could not have been suddenly swept away without great social and political disturbances, is not condemned in the same tone as immorality or unbelief. But that slavery practically, and, as we think, inevitably, presents features irreconcilable with other parts of the Christian scheme we cannot allow ourselves to doubt. Mr. Williams deduces one most curious consequence from the Biblical feature of this question. He declares that it makes men infidels. Going confidently to the Bible to find a denunciation of slavery, and not finding what they look for, they do not accept slavery, but refuse the Bible. Whether this be so or not it is for Americans themselves to say. If true, it is an application of the maxim of *fiat justitia ruat cælum* as novel as it is characteristic.

The form in which this volume was first composed is unfavourable to logical precision or excellence of method. Mr. Williams is diffuse and tautologous when read continuously, though probably such was not the effect produced by these *Letters* when they appeared separately. The reader finds it very difficult to gain a connected idea of his whole case, as he wishes to present it to the world; or to divide the arguments which are used absolutely from those which weigh only relatively, and both, again, from such as are merely recriminative. Mr. Williams's style, too, is not strong nor yet elegant. And the most laudable feature in the book, considering the circumstances under which it was composed, is the sobriety of tone which it displays, and the absence of that virulent party spirit which distinguishes so many of his countrymen. From the more purely political chapters of this work we scarcely imagine that anything very new is to be gathered. The case of

State rights and Federal rights has been pretty well argued out already; and when so candid a disputant, and so sincere a lover of the Union as Mr. O'Sullivan gives up the Federal case in despair, we may be sure not much remains to be said for it. We have not, therefore, given our readers any account of Mr. Williams's labours in this field. He proves very well what has been proved already; and, of course, it is no fault of his that other writers have anticipated him with the English public.

Le Père Lacordaire.*



OTWITHSTANDING that he has brought consummate ingenuity to the aid of a genuine enthusiasm, M. de Montalembert has failed to show that there was a place for the Abbé Lacordaire, any more than there is for himself, in the political system of modern Europe. The peer is the lay, as the priest was the clerical, representation of an impossible state of society. A legitimist radical and an ultramontane democrat are, at the best, but two well-intentioned anomalies; two living amalgamations of incongruous thought and sentiment which can only be kept out of mischief by being kept out of action. It is no answer to their objectors to point to the fact that the survivor of them is still an enthusiastic liberal and devoted Roman Catholic. We may believe, without any hesitation, that the institution which both M. de Montalembert and Le Père Lacordaire loved and revered next to the Papacy was the British Parliament; but their inability to see the antagonism between the two must still be reserved as a proof of their own eminent intellectual inconsistency. It is useless for men to raise a cry of *L'Eglise et la Liberté!* so long as there is nothing meant by *l'Eglise* but *l'Eglise Romaine*.

It is not to be supposed that such men as Montalembert and Lacordaire recognize the full effect of the disingenuousness which is contained in a claim for the inclusion of Roman Catholicism, along with all its subordinate institutions, in the toleration of modern times. Its aspirations and its necessities, no less than its antecedents, are fatal to its admission. It cannot be treated with the laxity and indifference which confer so much freedom but so little dignity upon the sects. We may minister, so far, to the pride of Roman Catholicism by confessing that its pre-eminence exposes it to the imposition of special restrictions. It is well known by all who fear it that the very first condition of its freedom must be the ambition of universal empire. But at the same time it is perfectly comprehensible that the narrow knot of French politicians represented by Lacordaire and his biographer should be unable to see how this allegiance to Rome should injuriously affect their political freedom at home. Their lot has been cast in an epoch that has been divided into two periods; during one of which there was no religious, and during the other no political life in France. They have, therefore, had no chance of experiencing a conflict which the alternating one-sidedness of this epoch has alone prevented. Had France under Louis Philippe been actively Roman Catholic, or were the country at this moment in the enjoyment of a constitutional government, the incompatibility between *L'Eglise* and *La Liberté* would probably be growing gradually apparent even to M. de Montalembert himself. It cannot be said of M. de Montalembert that he is not a student of history, though it is wonderful that his historical speculations should not have taught him all this. Of Lacordaire, however, he himself is fain to confess that he was glaringly ignorant of the past, and did most obstinately decline to acquaint himself with its precedents. Of him, therefore, it may be said, that he proclaimed the possibility of uniting two elements of whose natures and properties he had not informed himself either by theoretical speculation or practical experiment. His radicalism he took from his age, as his biographer con-

fesses, without inquiry; and in his youth he was a deist of the same conventional type.

"Fils d'un médecin du village," says Montalembert, "il avait, comme presque tous les jeunes gens de ce temps là, perdu la foi au collège, et ne l'avait retrouvée ni à l'école de droit ni au barreau, où il compta pendant deux ans parmi les avocats stagiaires. En apparence, rien ne le distinguait de ses contemporains; il était déiste comme l'était alors toute la jeunesse; il était surtout libéral comme la France entière. . . . Il partageait les convictions et les généreuses illusions que nous respirions tous alors dans l'air qu'avait purifié la chute du despotisme impérial."

Existing thus as a radical and a deist, while he simply took the creed of his generation for granted in both matters, he was a man of whom it does not astonish us to hear that he passed with consummate facility and suddenness into a new phase of religious belief:—

"Un coup subit et secret de la grâce lui ouvrit les yeux sur le néant de l'irreligion. En un seul jour il devient Chrétien, et le lendemain, de Chrétien il voulut être prêtre."

His friends might rejoice over the metamorphosis, and it might in reality have been a glorious product of Divine inspiration or of human impulse; but it was eminently unreasoned. He could not have laid bare to himself the foundations of his Christianity, any more than he could have previously recognized the basis of his Deism. As convention had provided him with the one, spiritual excitement had launched him into the other. That he should have retained his radicalism after he entered the priesthood is not so astonishing as M. de Montalembert seems to think it. It is far stranger that a man who is perplexed by the unwonted conjunction of political liberality and ecclesiastical enthusiasm in his dearest friend should stand forward as the apostle of a similar possibility for the whole of Europe. Lacordaire remained a liberal simply because, from the day of his ordination to the day of his death, the political condition of France afforded no area for the exhibition of an antagonism to the existence of which his eyes were otherwise unopened. Had he been an Italian instead of a Frenchman, he would have had his ignorance enlightened, and have found himself put to his election. As a Roman, or even a Piedmontese, he would either never have become a priest at all, or, having become so, would have lent his glorious eloquence to the faction of De Merode and Antonelli.

If anything were wanting to show how little either Lacordaire or Montalembert understood the bearings of the paradox they strove to promulgate, it would be the similarity which they imagined that they saw between their Roman Catholic France and Roman Catholic Ireland as expressed by O'Connell. Montalembert expressly calls Lacordaire "*le descendant et le continuateur de Saint Dominique de Bossuet et d'O'Connell*." The Ultramontanism of Ireland and of O'Connell must be taken solely as a manifestation against the Protestantism of England, and, in this, against the political unity of the Empire. In the Irish at large the expression is probably unconsciously made; in O'Connell himself it was, doubtless, deliberate. If all causes of irritation were removed from Ireland, it is more than probable that its enthusiastic Roman Catholicity would cool down into a very suspicious assimilation towards the Protestantism of the dominant island which lies between it and Rome. What O'Connell sought to show, and what Ireland shows now, neither was nor is a deliberate scheme for a combination between the Papacy and Repeal, but merely the intensity and the deeply-seated causes of that incompatibility which gave birth to the struggle for Repeal. Had Roman Catholic Ireland been in a state of complete harmony and good-will with her Protestant sister, no representative son of hers would ever have made an ostentatious journey to Rome; nor would any brigade of her citizens have found themselves in a scrape at Castel Fidardo. As surely as the Ultramontanism of Ireland is a mere symptom of fever, so surely is the astute insincerity of O'Connell no precedent for the passionate incongruity of Montalembert and his friend.

But the worthlessness of Lacordaire as a model does not prevent his having been a glorious and a valuable life. Valuable as an example, for although M. de Montalembert

* *Le Père Lacordaire. Par le Comte de Montalembert, l'un des Quarante de l'Académie Française.* Paris: Charles Douniol, Rue de Tournon 29.

still believes in him and in himself, France and Europe have learnt the lesson of his ill-success. He has not even a disciple among the Ultramontane clergy.

"Et cependant," complains his friend, "chose tristement étrange, lui, le plus grand des prêtres et le plus pur des démocrates, n'a jamais été accepté par la démocratie, n'a jamais été complètement goûté ni compris par le clergé."

In the face of this universal non-adhesion, why is M. de Montalembert not convinced? The whole world is never in the wrong. There is no instance on record of a generation having been deceived to a man. If ever a cause, good or bad, was fortunate in its advocate, this wild scheme of Radical Roman Catholicism was in Lacordaire. Young, eloquent, undoubtedly endowed with the highest gifts of oratory, which in him had the valuable accession of personal beauty; with the pulpit of Notre Dame at his disposal weekly for upwards of eighteen years; of a temperament as well as an exterior well constituted to attract; and of a reputation for saintliness beyond measure adapted to cement persuasion upon his audiences; of a literary and political fame, moreover, that had been confirmed long before his appearance as a preacher—to what must his absolute failure be ascribed? Surely to the utter impracticability of his subject-matter. The cause he had elected to plead was one that no advocate could serve. He had embarked upon a struggle in the prosecution of which he could gain fame for his ingenuity, sympathy for the faithfulness of his infatuation, reverence for his passionate holiness; but of adhesion none. The men who had grown willing to kiss the hem of his garment still shook their heads at the mention of the Temporal Power. He sowed piety and good works broadcast, and they had their fruit among his hearers. But for the creation of Ultramontanism, in a nation logically set upon political freedom, his genius and enthusiasm were alike powerless. Of the anomaly which he sought to prove normal he himself was almost the solitary impersonation, and, indeed, beyond the biographer who has so faithfully embalmed his memory, it would be difficult to find any other.

Les Misérables.*



VICTOR HUGO is the greatest poet of France, and one of her greatest novelists. There are those who maintain that he is the greatest of living poets. Assuredly, no one except Mr. Robert Browning rivals him in versatility and dramatic power; no one except Mr. Tennyson in rhythm and melody and music. His mastery over so unpoetical a language as the French is marvellous. The most skilful musician may be baffled by a wretched instrument: M. Hugo has not allowed his instrument to baffle him. Some of his lyrics and ballads are not excelled by anything yet written in any language.

M. Hugo, in his sixtieth year, is evidently in the prime of his intellectual life. *Les Misérables* is unquestionably his finest prose work. We find, however, the same difficulty in accurately estimating the depth and power of his religious convictions that existed forty years ago, when his first poems were published. Is his religion the result of faith or of sentiment? Does he, like Shakespeare, simply reflect the phases of human belief, as a clear pool mirrors the clouds, a mere momentary picture of the sky? In his *Odes et Ballades*, how strange and *bizarre* the mixture. Beautiful beyond description, a very page of primeval life, is *Moïse sur le Nil*, with its sublime conclusion:—

"Sous les traits d'un enfant délaissé sur les flots,
C'est l'Élu du Sina, c'est le roi des fléaux,
Qu'une vierge sauve de l'onde.
Mortels, vous dont l'orgueil méconnaît l'Eternel,
Fléchissez: un berceau va sauver Israël,
Un berceau doit sauver le monde!"

Yet the same volume contains ballads, like *La Chasse du Burgrave* and *La Légende de la Nonne*, which are morally unworthy of a great poet. This last work of his presents the same anomaly. It is the history of an escaped galley-

* *Les Misérables*. Brussels: A. Lacroix, Verboeckhoven and Co. London: Hurst and Blackett.

slave, whose conscience is awakened by the Christian charity of a bishop whom he robs. It is worked out with admirable detail, and may be fitly described as a noble lesson on the possibility of true repentance even in the vilest and most degraded. Yet herewith we get much description of illicit love—much also that an English reader will consider blasphemous. M. Hugo may hold that, in dealing with Paris life, the former was inevitable: but he surely cannot justify the latter. We cannot cite the passages; they are too bad: they show something worse than mere want of taste, and are heavy blemishes in this remarkable work.

For the work is very remarkable. It may perhaps, in its early stage of conception, have been suggested by M. Dumas's *Monte Cristo*. But M. Hugo's is a far nobler development of the idea. The prisoner of the Château d'If comes back to revenge himself on his persecutors, his power to do so being acquired in an utterly absurd manner. *Jean Valjeau* does none save deeds of kindness after his conscience is awakened by *Monsieur Bienvenu*; and his adventures, strange as they are, cannot be called improbable. The two heroes of the drama—for the work is essentially dramatic—are *Jean Valjeau* and *Javert*, the escaped galley-slave and the policeman. All the other characters, definite and distinct as they are, are strictly secondary. Yet each is a marvellous picture. *Fantine*, the ignorant victim of seduction, whom her maternal love rescues from utter vileness,—*Cosette*, whose purity has been refined by strange misfortunes,—*Marius*, the political enthusiast, sincere, dreamy, illogical,—*Tholomys* and his friends, young men devoid of heart and brain,—*Enjolras* and his comrades, youth of a nobler type, impatient of social wrongs, and eager to sacrifice their lives for their ideal republic,—the wonderful group of thieves and scoundrels, each a distinct conception:—all these are brought before us with Shakespearian vividness. But the action of the drama is with *Valjeau* and *Javert*. Rigour of law contends with freedom of conscience in these two men. The one is personified repentance—the other personified justice. *Valjeau*, whom the law has made an outcast, acts always nobly and conscientiously: *Javert*, servant of the law, is a human bloodhound, a thief-tracking machine. One of M. Hugo's ablest critics has questioned the possibility of a *forçat's* being rendered penitent so suddenly. "Es-ce," he asks, "que la main d'un évêque touche plutôt un *forçat* qu'un bonnête homme?"

We, who remember the Pharisee and the publican—who remember how the thief upon the Cross saw suddenly before him the glorious vista which leads to Paradise—who remember how Mary Magdalene was pardoned—are not disposed to quarrel with M. Hugo on this ground. And the good bishop's charity to *Jean Valjeau* was of a nature which an honest man could not have received from him: he took in the convict when every inn refused him—and, when the police brought back the ingrate with the bishop's plate in his possession, Monseigneur declared that he had given it to him. Such a proceeding may seem irrational; and it is worse; but it is in keeping with the good prelate's character as sketched by M. Hugo; and its result, we maintain, is in no degree forced or improbable.

Still, the moral of the great antagonism which exists between *Valjeau* and *Javert* is scarcely defensible. It is revolutionary. M. Hugo would set conscience above law. But what is law, save the conscience of the majority? Where men are congregated, an established code is requisite, and that which the greater number believe right becomes law. And law is often unjust—although not often so flagrantly as in *Valjeau's* case. For stealing a loaf, when in a state of starvation, he suffered nineteen years at the galleys—five years in the first instance, but prolonged by his attempts to escape. We have already noticed the difficulties in which he was placed by his position as a liberated convict. Possibly our own ticket-of-leave men are in similar perplexity, and are often driven into renewed crime by the impossibility of earning their livelihood honestly. Still the conscience of the people must be supreme over the conscience of the individual. Law must rule. As our social arrangements become more complete,

injustice will approach the minimum: but while men are human, while there is shadow upon earth as well as light, there will assuredly be *some* injustice. Often the man who deems himself most just is in reality most unjust. And even the "just," are to be "made perfect" before they tread the streets of that city whose glittering turrets arise in "the land which is very far off."

"Cœlestis O Jerusalem,
Mansura semper Civitas!"

But M. Victor Hugo is revolutionary—in theology and ethics as in politics. In his most famous novel he makes one of his characters exclaim—"The printing-press will efface the cathedral." Typography shows no symptoms of destroying architecture as yet—although the former is in its most brilliant state, and the latter by no means brilliant. It may be that the men who built our great cathedrals could not have written good newspaper articles; it is equally certain that neither the leader-writers of printing-house square, nor any of their contemporaries, can build as those men built. M. Hugo seems, however, to believe, not only that typography must efface architecture, but also that conscience must destroy law. The first is as strange a belief for a poet as the second for a philosopher; M. Hugo is both. Does he not think the church of Saint Ouen at Rouen something finer than the *Constitutionnel*? Can he not see that to set conscience above law would only be possible if all men were perfect, whereas all men are imperfect?

The English translation of M. Victor Hugo's work can only be characterized by one epithet—*abominable*. It should have been intrusted to a man of some ability. To begin with, the translator, whose name is Wraxall, apologizes in his preface for making two omissions. One is M. Hugo's chapter on Cambronne's reply when asked to surrender—the other is an essay on the monastic system, which Mr. Wraxall thought might be misapprehended in England, M. Esquiros thinking otherwise. Now, we hold that in the case of a book like *Les Misérables* no such omission should be tolerated. M. Hugo is an artist; every line which he writes is an integral part of his design. If Mr. Wraxall had chosen to abridge the work, it would have been otherwise. He might then have omitted the account of Waterloo, of the French Revolution, the essay on *Argot*, and much else which does not in any way help the progress of the story. But, translating *Les Misérables* for an English public, he had no right to omit a word. This is not all; he does not even tell the truth about his omissions. "*With these two very slight omissions the work is perfect.*" The first of these "slight omissions" is a chapter of six pages; the second is eight chapters, and extends to forty-four pages; and there are others unacknowledged. A whole chapter is omitted, vol. ii. p. 127, with the heading *Christus nos liberavit*. Did Mr. Wraxall leave it untranslated because he could not understand its beauty and its pathos? Again, vol. viii. p. 290, the love-rhymes made by the young students as they waited at their barricade are entirely ignored. A gentleman who cannot translate poetry has no business with a book of Victor Hugo's. These are important omissions: others more trivial we have noticed, which decidedly detract from the value of the translation. There are, moreover, many examples of mistranslation and vulgarity. To render into English the lyrical epigrammatic antithetic prose of France's greatest writer is no easy task. After reading the original no possible translation could content us. But Mr. Wraxall does not trouble himself to write even intelligible English. He talks of a "large gilt general's epaulettes"—which reminds one of the auctioneer's "mahogany lady's work table." Again, here is a sentence: "What there is below man distinguishes there through the mist what there is beyond man." A high reward might safely be offered to any one who could annex a meaning to this sentence, yet the French is perfectly clear. This is only one example out of many which might be given of the translator's absolute helplessness when the author departs from the ordinary track of thought. We regret that M. Hugo's great work did not fall into abler hands.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

The "Church and State Review" is published on the first of each month, price 1s., or free by post for one year for 14s., payable in advance.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.

A Page	£9 0 0
A Column	4 10 0
Five Lines	0 5 0
Every additional Line	0 1 0

Advertisements must reach the Office not later than the 24th of each Month.

OFFICE: 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

THE Church and State Review,

EDITED BY

ARCHDEACON DENISON.

Published Monthly, Price 1s., per Post, 1s. 2d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 1.

Review of the Position.
The Question of Retrenchment.
The Church-rate Division.
The American War.
The Clergy Relief Bill. Non-intervention.
The Ebb-tide of Democracy.
"Liberalism" as a Creed. Joseph Wolff.

Modern Incredulity.
The Royal Supremacy.
Church and State in America.
Hymnology. Poverty of the Clergy.
Scotch Communion Office. Bigotry.
Convocation in Ireland.

Rugby and Balliol.
The Position and Prospects of Convocation.
Judgment in Synod.
The Church in the Manufacturing Districts.
The Evidence of Infidelity.
Marriage Licence. The Re-revised Code.
The International Exhibition.

The Life of William Pitt.
Biblical Psychology.
Mendelssohn's Letters.
Lord Auckland's Correspondence.
Mrs. Browning.
Dean Ramsay on the Christian Life.
Dr. Cumming. Miss Sewell on Rome, &c.
Recent Fiction.

CONTENTS OF NO. 2.

Earl Russell. The National Society.
The Whigs and the Church of England.
Mexico. Clergy Relief and Burial Bill.
The Ballot. Mr. Estcourt.
Earl Canning.

Innkeepers. The Way of Unity.
Dilapidations. Body Snatchers.
For Better for Worse. Summary of Events.

Our Want of Clergy. Modern Warfare.
Ultimate Appeal Court.
The Latitudinarian School.
Mission Houses. The Royal Academy.
The Bicentenary. Gipsies.

Carlyle's "Frederick the Great."
Miss Sewell on Rome, &c. Edward Irving.
The Church and the Churches.
Life amongst the Colliers.
Monastic Life. Secularia.
Psychological Inquiries.

CONTENTS OF NO. 3.

Practical Politics.
Judgment in the Court of Arches.
The Session of 1862. Austria and Hungary.
The Oxford Congress. Prussia.
Committee of the National Society.
Editor's Note. Bishop Mackenzie.

Increase of the Episcopate.
Henley Regatta. Bishopric of Honolulu.
Summary.

Musical Development.
Architectural Development.
Windermere. The Influence of the Clergy.
Medding. Rural Schools.

Church Expansion, &c.
The Present Position of the Liberal Party.
Threelfold Nature of Man.
The Astronomy of the Ancients.
Sisters of Mercy. Kingaleym.
Thirty Years of Musical Recollections.
Schleiermacher.

CONTENTS OF NO. 4.

Political Parties.
Relief of Distress in the North.
Lord Canning's Administration of India.
Mr. Disraeli. The Zambesi Mission.
Canada. India.
The Bishop of Bath and Wells and Mr. Lingens.
The War in America.

The Musical Season.
The Lay Element in America.
Suffragan Bishops.
The Northern Convocation.
Summary of Events.

The Use and Abuse of Multitudes.
The Way of Unity. (II.) Salads.
Smoking. Brotherhoods.
Pews and Free Sittings.

Thackerayism. M. Guizot.
Hawaii.
Twenty Years of Financial Policy.
Creation in Plan and in Progress.
The Astronomy of the Ancients.
Correspondence of Napoleon I.

CONTENTS OF NO. 5.

The Primacy.
Political Parties. House of Lords.
The Scandinavian Alliance. Harvest-home.
The New Dogma.
Church Schools, the "Conscience Clause,"
and the Charity Commissioners.
Eastern Asia.
Mr. Steuart.
Mr. Coleridge and the "Liberals" of Exeter.

Causes which produced the Low Religious
Tone of the Eighteenth Century.
Commercial Travellers.
Mission-houses in Populous Places.
Cricket. Religious Statistics of Scotland.
Sons of the Turf. Summary of Events.
Dickensism. Perry's Church History.
Life of Lord Bacon.
The Public Life of Lord Macaulay.
Kirche und Kirchen, Herr Von Döllinger.
A. N. Welby Pugin.
Ten Years of Imperialism in France.
Arthur Hugh Clough.

The CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW may be obtained at all the Railway Book-stalls, and of all Booksellers in Town and Country.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square, W.

CRYSTAL PALACE SCHOOL of ART, Science, and Literature. The Third Term will Commence November 1 and close July 31, 1863.

Water-colour Painting—Mr. Edward Goodall.
Drawing and Modelling—Mr. W. K. Shenton.
English Literature and Elocution—Mr. J. S. Stallybrass.
French—Professor Cassal, LL.D.
German—Dr. G. Kinkel.
Italian—Signor Girolamo Volpe.
Latin—Rev. C. Boutell, M.A.
History—Rev. C. Boutell, M.A.
Physical Geography, Arithmetic, and Mathematics—Herr A. Sonnenschein.
Botany—Dr. Chr. Dresser.
Chemistry—Dr. D. S. Price.
Pianoforte—Mr. J. Benedict, Mr. Lindsay Sloper, Mr. E. Prout, B.A.
Singing—Signor Garcia, Madame Collinet.
Part Singing and Choral Practice—Mr. Henry Leslie, Mr. J. G. Callcott.
Dancing—Mr. Louis D'Egville.

Pupils joining any one or more of the above classes will have, among other privileges, free use of the Company's library and reading room, with admission to the Palace on the day the class meets. A detailed prospectus with regulations for inscription of pupils, &c., can be obtained at the office of the Literary Department (near the Byzantine Court), Crystal Palace, where pupils can be inscribed.

By order of the Committee,

EDWARD LEE, Sup. Lity. Dept.

ROYAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

HEAD OFFICES,

29, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON, AND ROYAL
INSURANCE BUILDINGS, LIVERPOOL.

The following is an Epitome of the Leading Results shown at the Annual Meeting of Shareholders, on the 8th inst. :—

FIRE BRANCH.

Large as the revenue under this branch had become in preceding years, the year 1861 has produced a further increase of fire revenue, the premiums having attained the sum of 292,402*l.*, being an increase in a single year of 29,425*l.*

The fire revenue has more than doubled in the last six years, the total increase being upwards of 160,000*l.*, an advance by natural expansion, which is probably without parallel.

The government returns of duty place the Royal, as respects increase of business, at the head of the offices.

LIFE BRANCH.

The prominent feature is the increase and great amount of the new business transacted by this Company, the sum assured under new policies alone for the past year amounting to 521,101*l.*; exceeding, by 70,000*l.*, the new insurances of the preceding year, which again had shown a great advance on its predecessors.

This large amount of business (and upon which the current year shows a yet further advance), is believed to result from public confidence, and from the signal advantage the life branch possesses in being so lightly burdened, the fire branch, from its magnitude, bearing by far the larger share of the general expenses of management, an advantage few companies possess to the like extent.

The total paid-up Capital and Accumulated Funds of the Company were certified by the Auditors to amount to 846,000*l.*

PERCY M. DOVE, Manager.

JOHN B. JOHNSTONE, Secretary.

October, 1862.

THE FRIENDS of MISSIONARY WORK

IN IRELAND are earnestly requested by the Bishop of Tuam, to ASSIST in COMPLETING the SUM REQUIRED for the ENDOWMENT of the Districts of CASTLEKERKE and DERRYGIMLA. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have promised to build a Church in each district, provided the required sum shall have been procured before the 1st of December. The West Connaught Endowment Society have already collected 3,500*l.* The BALANCE now required to complete the endowment, and secure the building of the Churches is 1,500*l.* The following are some of the Contributions already received :—

	£		£
The Late Lord Primate of Ireland	100	Stephen Hankey, Esq.	50
Lord Leconfield	100	Mrs. Oakely	50
An English Clergyman	500	B. L. Guinness, Esq.	50
Mr. Kemble	100	Mrs. Gibbons	50

FURTHER CONTRIBUTIONS will be thankfully received by the BISHOP of TUAM, his Chaplain, the Rev. W. C. PLUNKETT, the Palace, Tuam, or by MESSRS. RANSOMS, Pall Mall East, London.

THE TEA TRADE.

[ANNUAL CIRCULAR.]

ROYAL BANK BUILDINGS,

Liverpool, October 1st, 1862.

THE inducement and protection at present given to Enterprise and Capital in the interior of the Chinese Empire are such that we may look for a most abundant supply of Tea this Season. Both "Royalists and Rebels" have become rivals in their endeavours to give increased security to the British Merchant.

We copy from the "China Overland Trade Report," China, 26th July. "Silk is abundant at Shanghai, and Teas at Hankow, Kewkiang and Foo-chow. The number of Steamers plying on the Yangtze River excites unfeigned astonishment. Rates of freight have, however, materially declined, and appearances would warrant the conclusion that there is an excess of competition in the Trade."

China exhibits a degree of order and prosperity, of contentment and tranquillity, which the English people were little prepared to hear, and the Chinaman will soon find that Commerce is the foundation-stone of every Nation's greatness, and one of the principal Engines of Civilization.

We most cheerfully concur in the prospect of Abundant Imports. Several cargoes of FINE BLACK TEA are to arrive in October, and our numerous Customers may depend that, with extended arrangements, their orders will be despatched without delay.

** * This Branch of our Trade—the serving of Families—was opened September, 1840, and founded upon a principle calculated to afford the greatest advantage in Price, with every possible security as to Quality.*

BANKERS:—

For the special convenience of Families, we have an Account open with

The CITY BANK (Threadneedle Street)	London.
" NATIONAL BANK OF SCOTLAND	Edinburgh.
" BANK OF IRELAND	Dublin.
" GLOUCESTERSHIRE BANKING COMPANY	Chester.
" NATIONAL BANK OF SCOTLAND	Glasgow.
" BANK OF ENGLAND	Liverpool.
" ROYAL BANK	Liverpool.

—Amounts paid into any of the above Banks, on our account, advising us of the same, will be duly passed to credit. Remittances can also be made direct to us by Bankers' cheques, Post-office Orders, &c.

Your obliged and faithful Servants,

ROBT. ROBERTS & COMPY.
Tea and Coffee Salesmen.

Near the Exchange.—LIVERPOOL.

44, LORD STREET, LIVERPOOL.

THE FIRST ARRIVALS.

THE Ships which left China with the first Cargoes of NEW TEAS for the English Markets this Season have now arrived.

The TEAS are found in some instances to be STRONG AND FULL-FLAVOURED, with the *richness* peculiar to the earliest pickings of THE FIRST CROP ; but it requires matured and practical judgment in the selection of the TRULY FINE qualities. Samples are forwarded for approval when requested ; and our system of business secures to Families the advantage of obtaining their supplies *in any quantities*, at the moderate prices to which they have a PERFECT RIGHT, viz. :—

The Choicest GUNPOWDER TEA, 5s. per lb.

The Choicest SOUCHONG, 4s. 2d. per lb.

The First-class CONGOU, 3s. 10d. per lb.

All of which will be found VERY SUPERIOR.

Our excellent MEDIUM QUALITIES of STRONG CONGOU, at 3s. per lb., and the FINE CONGOU (RIPE AND STRONG PEKOE-SOUCHONG KIND), at 3s. 6d. per lb., are well worth SPECIAL ATTENTION.

For the convenience of Families, *we deliver Parcels daily within a distance of Four Miles from our Establishment*, 44, LORD STREET ; and, to save disappointment, the orders should reach us not later than the morning previous to delivery, as the Vans are despatched each day at One o'clock precisely. Goods for the Country are despatched punctually on the day following the receipt of Orders.

English Families and others residing abroad may rest assured of our continued care in the prompt execution of Foreign Orders (under bond, duty free). OUR STRICT PERSONAL ATTENTION *to this department of the business, for many years, has secured to us a* CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT *of Foreign Trade.*

Your obliged and faithful servants,

ELLIS DAVIES AND COMPY.,

TEA AND COFFEE SALESMEN,

44, LORD STREET,
LIVERPOOL.

HAILEYBURY COLLEGE.—*Head Master* —The Rev. ARTHUR GRAY BUTLER, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

Terms of Admission.

Pupils not nominated to pay—
Sons of Laymen, 6*5*l. per annum.
Sons of Clergymen, 5*5*l.
Pupils nominated to pay 10*l*. less in each case.
Donors of 100*l*. entitled to have always one pupil in the School.
Donors of 26*l*. 5*s*. entitled to nominate one pupil.
The holidays will be at the same times of the year as at Eton and Harrow. The School will be opened on Thursday the 11th of September next.
All communications are to be addressed to the
Rev. LEWIS DEEDS, Bramfield Rectory, Hertford, } *Hon. Secs.*
E. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Amwell, Ware, }

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, RADLEY.

Visitor—The Lord Bishop of Oxford.

TRUSTEES.

His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.

The Hon G. C. Talbot. The Warden of All Souls', Oxford.
Lieut.-Col. Robert Moorsom. J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P.
Robert Phillimore, Esq., D.C.L.
The Lord Richard Cavendish.

Warden—Rev. Richard Whitmore Norman, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Sub-Warden—Rev. William Wood, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

FELLOWS.

W. Haskoll, Captain, R.N., Bursar.
Rev. R. S. Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose Coll., Oxford.
Rev. E. N. Reynolds, A.M., Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.
J. H. Rawdon, M.A., Brasenose Coll., Oxford.
Rev. A. L. Hussey, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.
C. A. Houghton, B.A., Exeter Coll., Oxford.
R. F. Clarke, B.A., Fellow of St. John's Coll., Oxford.
W. W. Jackson, B.A., Balliol Coll., Oxford.
R. Laing, Esq., Wadham Coll., Oxford.
George Wharton, B.A., Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

ASSISTANT TUTORS.

Rev. W. G. Longden, M.A., Fellow of Queen's Coll., Cambridge.
Rev. R. Gibbings, A.M., Trinity Coll., Dublin.
Lecturer in History—Sidney Owen, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.
Director of French—M. Jules Buë.
Drawing (Military Drawing and Water Colours)—W. H. F. Hutchisson, Esq.
Gymnasium—A. Maclaren, Esq.

The College reopened on the 12th Sept., 1862.

The Scholarship of 30*l*., founded by Sir Walter James, Bart., for annual competition by candidates under eighteen years of age; and the Scholarship of 20*l*., founded by William Gibbs, Esq., for candidates under fifteen years of age, will be competed for at Michaelmas next.

Parents of Boys not members of the School, but desirous of competing for either Scholarship, may apply to the Junior Bursar, George Price, Esq., St. Peter's College, Radley, Abingdon.

BRIDGWATER GRAMMAR SCHOOL.

Head Master—Rev. T. STANTIAL, M.A., Oxon. Author of the Student's Test Book.
The Head Master receives into his house a few young Gentlemen. An effort is made to combine home comforts and influence with the advantages of a high course of education. A Prospectus of Terms, &c., will be forwarded on application.

THE Rev. D. BINNEY prepares Boys for the Winchester College Elections, or other Public Schools. Terms and References on application. Address, The Elms, Shirley, near Southampton.

ST. MARGARET'S COLLEGE, NORTH-END, London, S. W. (near the Kensington Station), for the Education of Young Ladies.

Principal—Rev. ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A.
Lady-Superintendent—Mrs. LENDRUM.

The education and discipline are conducted, under the direction and superintendence of the principal, by talented and accomplished Governesses, English and Foreign, assisted by eminent London Professors. The buildings consist of a spacious Mansion, with grounds of considerable extent, and large and lofty rooms. Twenty of the senior pupils have separate sleeping apartments.

The next term will commence, after the Midsummer holidays, on Tuesday, the 23rd of September.

N.B.—No day pupils are received.

Prospectuses and particulars sent on application.

St. Mary's College, Bampton, Oxon.

UNDER the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Instituted January, 1859, for the purpose of affording a "Public School" Education on Church principles to those of limited means.

The sons of the Clergy, Officers in Her Majesty's Service, and Professional Gentlemen only are received.

The course of Instruction includes Theology, the Classics (with special regard to Prose and Verse Composition), Mathematics, French, German, English, Drawing, Vocal Music, and Drilling.

Fee for Board, Tuition in all Subjects, Washing and Stationery, 9*l*. per quarter, in advance. Printed particulars on receipt of two Stamps.

G. H. DREWE, Warden and Head Master.

S. Andrew's College, Chardstock, Dorset.

A PREPARATORY SCHOOL for the Sons of the Clergy and Laity of small means.

Principal—The Rev. Charles Woodcock, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, and Vicar of the Parish.

Head Master—The Rev. Francis Allen, B.A., Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by a competent staff of Masters.

Terms:—Entrance fee Two Guineas; board, washing, and education, Ten Guineas a quarter, paid in advance. This charge covers all expenses. Full particulars forwarded on application to the Principal.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced

TUTORS, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M.A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

HAWAIIAN CHURCH MISSION

(Sandwich Islands).

SUBSCRIPTIONS and DONATIONS may be sent to the SPECIAL FUND of this Mission at the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 79, Pall Mall; or to the account of the Treasurers of the Hawaiian Church Fund (J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P., and H. H. Gibbs, Esq.), at Messrs. Barnett, Hoare, and Co's., Bankers, 62, Lombard Street; or to Manley Hopkins, Esq., Hawaiian Consul-General, 4, Royal Exchange Buildings, London.

For information on the subject of the Mission, and for arrangements for Sermons, Meetings, Lectures, &c., address the Rev. Edward L. Cutts, Billericay, *Commissary of the Bishop of Honolulu, and Secretary to the Committee of the Hawaiian Church Mission.*

Church-Rates.

THE COMMITTEE of LAYMEN, while they congratulate Churchmen on the renewed rejection of the Abolition Bill, frankly and earnestly call upon all friends of the Constitution to support them with the pecuniary means requisite to ensure similar success for the future. The Committee have hitherto not received a tenth of the annual revenue placed at the disposal of those whose projects they have had to watch and counteract.

It is requested that contributions may be addressed expressly to "The Committee of Laymen," at the banks of Messrs. Hoare, 37, Fleet Street; and Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birch Lane, London; or to the Honorary Secretary, 16, Manchester Buildings, Westminster, S. W.

JOHN M. KNOTT, *Hon. Sec.*

June 30, 1862.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.

H. B. FARINGTON, *Hon. Sec.*

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED SOCIETY. Capital 100,000*l*. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

Queen Elizabeth's School, Ipswich.

Head Master (appointed January, 1858) **Rev. HUBERT ASHTON HOLDEN, M.A.**, sometime Fellow and Assistant-Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge; Senior Classic, 1854; Editor of "Aristophanes," "Minucius Felix," &c.; Examiner for the East India Civil Service, 1857; and formerly Vice-Principal of Cheltenham College.

Sub-Master—**Rev. Henry A. Barclay, M.A.**, of Christ Church, Oxford, sometime Senior Assistant-Master, Trinity College, Glenalmond, N.B.

Mathematical Master—**Francis Patrick, Esq., B.A.**, Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge; and Eighth Wrangler, 1861.

For Terms of admission apply to the Head-Master. The vacations are at the same times as at Eton and Harrow.

THE PRESENT TERM DIVIDES ON NOVEMBER 1.

The ALBERT MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP will be open for Competition to Boys who have been in the School not less than Two Years.

Private Tuition.

THE REV. G. H. PARMINTER, B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of S. John and S. George, Exeter—**PRIVATE TUTOR** for the Examinations for the UNIVERSITIES, ARMY, and NAVY, takes SIX Pupils.

During a long series of years Mr. Parminter's Pupils have taken high or good places, and one in the present year PASSED FIRST in the Examination for DIRECT COMMISSIONS.

Wynard House, Magdalen Hill, Exeter.

BROOKING SCHOOL, TOTNES, DEVON, three miles

from the Totnes and Brent Stations on the South Devon Railway.

Visitor—The Ven. the ARCHDEACON OF TOTNES.

Principal—**Rev. E. H. COLE, B.A.**, Trinity College, Oxford.

Head Master—**Mr. MORGAN.**

French Master—**M. C. LE CLAIR.**

Drill Master—**Serg. THOMAS.**

The course of instruction includes Greek, Latin, French and English Languages and Composition, History, Geography, Mathematics, Mensuration, Land surveying, Book-keeping, Drawing, and Vocal Music.

TERMS:

Boarders—Mathematical and Commercial Department . . . £ 30 per annum.

—Classical 35 "

Day Boys 5 "

Paid Quarterly in advance. No extras.

The Pupils reside in the Parsonage, and are under the immediate care of the Principal and his Wife.

Address for further particulars, **Rev. E. H. Cole, Brooking Parsonage, Totnes**; or **Rev. R. Champenowne, Dartington Rectory, Totnes.**

SEASIDE Private Tuition. The **Rev. T. J. NUNNS, M.A.**, St. John's College, Cambridge, (First Class in Classics) receives pupils into his house to be prepared for the Universities, or for the Civil Service, or Military Examinations. Terms, according to age, 150 or 160 Guineas a-year. Seaford, Sussex.

HOME MISSIONS. The Committee of the

Additional Curates Society earnestly appeal for funds to enable them to continue their Grants in support of 432 Curates; and to relieve some of the most urgent cases at present unaided. 163 unaided cases are on the Society's Books.

Rev. W. R. COSENS, M.A., Secretary,
7, Whitehall, London, S.W.

ST. PAUL, near PENZANCE.—Our Parish

Church was burned down by the Spaniards in 1579. The roofs of nave and two aisles, the internal walls, and the irregular pews, are all sadly dilapidated; the population is 5,500, chiefly the "Mounts-bay fishermen." We have preserved our church-rate to support public worship, and we have just succeeded in rebuilding our Church Town Schools, and opening them for boys and girls under certificated teachers. We have obtained a set of plans for reseating and restoring our Church from Messrs. Salter and Perrow, Architects, 7, Wood Street, Westminster; 315 additional sittings will be secured, and declared free and unappropriated for ever. Will Christian friends help us to procure the required fund of 1,000l.?

CONTRIBUTIONS, either in donations or four or five annual instalments, may be paid to the "St. Paul Church Fund," at the Bank of Messrs. Drummond, Charing Cross, London; and Messrs T. S. Bolitho and Sons, Penzance.

"It pitieth us to see her in the dust."

JOHN GARRETT, Vicar of St. Paul,
WILLIAM HARVEY, Kerria,
WILLIAM ANGWIN, Mousehole, } Church-wardens.

St. Paul, near Penzance, 28, October 1862.

Cramer, Beale, & Wood's PIANOFORTE GALLERY,

207 & 209, REGENT STREET.

CRAMER AND Co. have opened their spacious Gallery, Nos. 207 and 209, REGENT STREET, with a Selection of **PIANOFORTES**, which, for variety and excellence, is not surpassed, if equalled, by that of any similar Establishment in the United Kingdom.

Hitherto Purchasers in London have had no opportunity to compare, side by side, the Instruments of the chief houses, as each maker only exhibits his own. **CRAMER & Co.** now show under the same roof all the different kinds of Pianofortes manufactured by Broadwood, Collard, Erard, and other eminent Makers. In purchasing from **CRAMER & Co.** the public may rely on the quality of the Instruments being stated without reserve. Pianofortes of the very inferior class are carefully excluded from the Gallery. Among the superior class there are degrees of excellence, both as regards tone and external appearance, which vary with the prices. **CRAMER & Co.**'s Assistants will on all occasions carefully point out the special quality of each Instrument, enabling the Purchaser to form a correct judgment, and select a suitable Pianoforte.

If on any occasion an Instrument should fail to give entire satisfaction, it may be changed within six months from the date of purchase, if returned to **CRAMER & Co.** free of expense.

CRAMER, BEALE, AND WOOD'S NEW MODEL COTTAGE PIANOFORTE, price 35, 38, and 40 guineas. These Instruments, elegant in design, are carefully constructed with choice and well-seasoned material, by the most skilled workmen.

CRAMER AND CO'S. PIANETTE, a superior Pianoforte with check action, especially adapted for Small Rooms. Price 25 guineas.

PIANOFORTES EXPRESSLY CONSTRUCTED FOR EXTREME CLIMATES, packed in cases lined with zinc, and forwarded to all parts of the world.

HARMONIUMS.

DEBAIN'S HARMONIUMS received the Prize Medal and the very highest commendation. Their superiority has been incontestably maintained. **M. Debain** is the inventor of the Harmonium.

No. 1.	Polished oak case, one stop, four octaves	6	6	0
	Ditto Ditto five octaves	9	9	0
2.	" three stops	12	12	0
3.	" five stops	14	14	0
4.	" seven stops	19	19	0
5.	" nine stops	22	22	0
6.	" eleven stops	28	28	0
7.	" thirteen stops and knee action	36	36	0
8.	" fifteen stops	42	42	0
9.	" nineteen stops	59	59	0
	WITH PERCUSSION.			
10.	" nine stops	29	29	0
11.	" thirteen stops	32	32	0
12.	" seventeen stops and knee action	60	60	0
13.	" twenty-one stops	87	87	0

CRAMER, BEALE, and WOOD, Sole Agents.

EVERY MAN HIS OWN ORGANIST.—DEBAIN'S

ANTIPHONEL, a substitute for an Organist or Harmonium player, by which any person without knowledge of music, can play hymn tunes, psalms, and chants. It is also adapted for the performance of overtures, quadrilles, waltzes, &c. It can easily be applied to or detached from any existing Organ or Harmonium, and is not liable to derangement. Price 12 guineas.

CRAMER, BEALE, AND WOOD, 207, Regent Street, London.—Wholesale Warehouse,
43, Watling Street.

HEDGES AND BUTLER beg to direct atten-

tion to their French and German Wines, comprising Chablis, Sauterne, Barsac, St. Peray, La Rose, Latour, Margaux, Lafitte, Chamberlain, Côte Rôtie, St. George, Clos Vougeot, Hermitage, Nierstein, Hockheimer, Liebfraumilch, Rudesheimer, Johannisberger, Steinberger, Assmanshausen, Brauneberger, Muscatel Moselle, Sparkling Hock, Moselle, and Champagne.

Messrs. H. and B. respectfully recommend their **SUPERIOR GOLDEN SHERRY**, of soft and full flavour, at 36s. per dozen. **PALE GOLDEN and BROWN SHERRY**, 42s., 48s., 54s. **FINE OLD PORT**, 48s. to 72s. **MADEIRA, BUCELLAS, TOKAY**, and every other description of Wine.

* * * Orders must be accompanied by a remittance or reference in London, on receipt of which any quantity will be immediately forwarded by **HEDGES AND BUTLER, Wine Merchants, &c., 155, Regent Street, London, and 30, King's Road, Brighton.** (Originally established A.D. 1667.)

N.B. Agents for, and Bottlers of, Bass & Co's. India Pale Ale.

The Conservative Land Society.

THE ELEVENTH YEAR. Trustees—

VISCOUNT RANELAGH, and J. C. COBBOLD, Esq., M.P. This Society has now entered on its Eleventh Year, having been established on September 7th, 1852. Prospectuses, explanatory of the Share, Deposit, Land and Building Departments, will be sent, free of charge, to any part of the world. No Partnership Liability, and the taking of land entirely optional. Present rate of interest, payable in half-yearly warrants, 5 per cent. per annum on Shares (with participation in any profits above that allowance), and 4 per cent. per annum on Deposit Accounts, the Investors not becoming Members of the Society.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.

Offices, 33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of **CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING**, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

* * A Catalogue, containing above 300 Woodcuts, and Estimates free upon application.

Established 1838.

COX and SON, Ecclesiastical Warehouses, 28 and 29, Southampton Street, Strand, London. Painted and Stained Glass Works, 43 and 44, Maiden Lane (adjoining Southampton Street). Wood and Stone Carving, and Gothic Metal Works, Belvedere Road, Lambeth. A New Edition of the Illustrated Catalogue of Church Furniture, Painted Glass, and Decorations, forwarded on receipt of Six Postage Stamps.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE. An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

CHURCH and DECORATIVE EMBROIDERY. FOR EVERY PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH. Executed from the best and most practicable Designs and Examples of **ANCIENT NEEDLEWORK.** Ante-pendia, Chancel-carpet, Sermon-cases, Book-markers, &c. &c., prepared with every facility for Ladies own working.

By **R. HELBRONNER**, 265, Regent Street, (near the Circus, Oxford Street).

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that **RICHARD LOADER and Co.** have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 116 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E.C.

GARDNER'S 2l. 2s. DINNER SERVICES complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3s. 6d. per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7s. 6d. per pair. **H. and J. GARDNER** (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices, for Cash only:—

The Complete Suit	52s.	63s.	and	85s.
Morning Coats	25s.	30s.	and	45s.
Trousers	16s. 6d.	21s.	and	26s. 6d.
Waistcoats	10s. 6d.	12s.	and	13s. 6d.
Frock and Overcoats	30s.	36s.	and	55s.

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors, next door to Somerset House, Strand.

KNICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15s. 6d.

At **B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY**,
150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25s.

At **B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY**,
150, Regent Street.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONIUMS, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Pianofortes, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3l. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—**ROYAL GERMAN SPA**, Brighton. Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by **GEORGE WAUGH & CO.**, Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

Old Bottled Port 20,000 Dozen.

Laid down during the last 40 Years.

NOW BOTTLING, 100 PIPES—1858 VINTAGE.

Pasto Sherries, Moselles, Hocks, and Champagnes. 1st Growth Clarets, Burgundies, and very old Virgin Marsalas, &c.

Price List of all Wines Post Free.

GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, London, E. C.

"St. Martin" Malaga, very choice, for Sacramental use, 50s. Best Rota Tent, 42s. net. On receipt of P. O. Order.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY

WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10s.; single sample, 2s.

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.

12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

Teeth.

OSTEO-EIDON.—What is it? See Patent, March 1, 1862, No. 560. **GABRIEL'S** Self-adhesive Patent Indestructible MINERAL TEETH and FLEXIBLE GUMS, without palate, springs, or wires, and without operation. One set lasts a lifetime, and warranted for mastication or articulation, even when all others fail. Purest materials only, at half the usual cost.

Messrs. **GABRIEL**, the old-established Dentists, 27, Harley Street, Cavendish Square, and 34, Ludgate Hill, London; 134, Duke Street, Liverpool; and 65, New Street, Birmingham. International Exhibition, Class 17.

One visit only requisite.

Gabriel's "Practical Treatise on the Teeth," gratis.

Complete sets from four to seven guineas, and ten to fifteen guineas. Consultations free.

84,000l. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at 3½ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, **Mr. STEPHENS**, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free. Also, **ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE.** Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

Exchanges and Advowsons.

WEST MIDLAND AND WEST OF ENGLAND
CLERICAL REGISTRIES (United).

Conducted by a Clergyman,—a late P. C. in the Diocese.
Offices, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link,
Worcestershire.

(Originated April, 1862: 150 Members, Beneficed Clergy and others.)

The above will be found an organized medium by the Clergy in connection with Clerical Business of all kinds, without intervention of agents; and as originated "to serve the Clergy," it is highly approved of by several Dignitaries of the Church, and patronized.

Prospectus on receipt of stamped envelope.

Curates supplied with Curacies, Holy Order Candidates with Titles.
Between 60 and 70 Exchanges offered to Members. Incomes from 100*l.* to 1900*l.* a-year.

Subscription for the year, 5*s.* (stamps* received) for Curates.

Beneficed Clergy Entrance fee, constituting Membership, reduced from original fee 10*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.*, to meet the wishes of the Clergy; it is therefore respectfully urged that applicants enclose their Subscription, to ensure desired information. Stamps* received, 13 to the 1*s.*

N.B. Several Advowsons and Presentations wanted to purchase immediately; Presentation to a living of 180*l.* net, for sale; Curacy can be held, and Interest allowed until vacancy. Also, a Living for sale in Derbyshire, Presentation or Advowson; 500*l.* a-year, highly eligible; early possession.

Address:—The Reverend the Secretary, as above.

Preparation for the Cambridge Voluntary Theological and Holy Orders Bishops' Examinations.

THE Advertiser, a Clergyman (M.A. Oxon.) of experience and great success in preparing gentlemen for the above, residing at Malvern, Worcestershire, (a delightfully-situated place for Reading, with every facility), has Vacancies; (37 gentlemen have read and passed from the Advertiser). His last pupils were a Durham B.A. and a Student of Christ Church, Oxford, for Priesthood; and he has now two reading for the September and Christmas Ordination, M.A.'s of Oxford—Diaconate and Priesthood.

Prospectus of terms and particulars on application.

Letters to contain real names and addresses. Clerical References required. Lodgings easily procured.

High Clerical References and to Pupils in Orders.

The Advertiser procures for his Pupils fit and proper Titles.

Address:—Reverend P. (care of The Reverend the Secretary),
W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link,
Worcestershire.

N.B. On Sunday last, the 21st of September, the M.A. alluded to above, as reading for the September Ordination, was ordained Deacon at East Retford, Lincolnshire, by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, having passed the examination.

SUNDAY DUTY at reduced charges taken by
a CLERGYMAN at shortest notice; if only for one Sunday, the fee of 1*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* and travelling expenses will be required: beyond one, and every succeeding Sunday, at 1*l.* 1*s.* and travelling expenses. References. Advertiser will be at liberty for Duty after Sunday the 26th of October.

Address:—Reverend S. (care of The Reverend the Secretary),
W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link,
Worcestershire.

Photographs of Clergymen taken Free of Charge.

Now ready, price 1*s.* 6*d.* each, post free,

**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PHOTOGRAPHIC
GALLERY.** The following Photographs of Bishops and Clergy can now be obtained of Mr. Poulton, Photographer, 352, Strand.

ARCHBISHOPS of Canterbury and York.
BISHOPS of London, Winchester, Oxford, Exeter, Durham, Lincoln, Sodor and Man, Moray and Ross, Columbia, Ripon, Rochester, New Zealand.

ARCHDEACONS Hale, Bickersteth, Mackenzie, Denison.
DOCTORS Trench, Milman, Hook, Close, Goodwin, Ellicott, Jacobson, Sewell, Guthrie, Temple, Williams, Cumming, and the late Dr. Wolff.

REVERENDS C. Kingley, Taughan, Bryan King, Hugh McNeile, Canon Dale, A. Poole of St. Barnabas, E. Coleridge, C. F. Lowder, J. Purchas, J. C. Ryle, Hugh Stowell, Upton Richards, W. Gresley, J. Mackonochie, A. B. Evans, M. Pattison, G. Nugee, W. J. E. Bennett, R. F. Littledale, T. Chamberlain, W. R. Wroth, A. F. Stanley, H. M. Butler, Le Geyt, J. M. Bellaw, Hugh Allen, A. Watson, and many others.

Every description of Photographic Work at the shortest notice.

S. POULTON, 352, Strand.

Now ready, price 14*s.*

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.

BY SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, BART., M.P.

London: SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

New Works by EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.

Crown 8vo. cloth, 1*s.*, by post 1*s.* 2*d.*

THE PRESERVATION OF GENERAL HEALTH.

With some Remarks upon Healthy Skin, and Subjects of Medical interest to the Public generally, including Notes upon Homœopathy, Nursing, or Attendance upon the Sick, and the Medical Art.

BY EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.

Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, Assistant Physician to the Royal General Dispensary, Member of the Hunterian Society, &c. &c.

London: HOULSTON AND WRIGHT, Paternoster Row.

Also by the same Author, fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*, by post, 1*s.* 2*d.*

SKIN DISEASES,

AND THEIR CURE BY DIATHETICAL TREATMENT.

ILLUSTRATED BY CASES.

London: HENRY RENSHAW, 356, Strand.

Seventh Edition, fcap. 2*s.* 6*d.* sewed; or 3*s.* cloth.

THE WATER-CURE in CHRONIC DISEASE: an Exposition of the Causes, Progress, and Termination of various Chronic Diseases of the Digestive Organs, Lungs, Nerves, Limbs, and Skin; and of their Treatment by Water and other Hygienic Means. By JAMES MANBY GULLY, M.D., L.R.C.S., and F.R.P.S. Edinburgh, and F.R.M.C.S. London, &c.

"Dr. Gully has published a large and elaborate work on the Water Cure, which is, we think, the best treatise on the subject that has yet appeared."—*Westminster Review*.

"Dr. Gully's book is evidently written by a well-educated medical man. This work is by far the most scientific that we have seen on hydropathy."—*Athenæum*.

"Of all the expositions which have been published respecting the Water Cure, this is the most tangible and complete."—*Literary Gazette*.

London: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO.,
Stationers' Hall Court.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS at BULL'S LIBRARY.—Surplus Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices*. Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

2*d.* IN THE 1*s.* DISCOUNT ALLOWED
on BOOKS and MAGAZINES purchased at 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

PARCELS OF 5*l.* VALUE (at this rate) sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

CLERGYMEN, BOOK SOCIETIES, and LARGE BUYERS, supplied on more advantageous terms.

MAGAZINES supplied regularly on the 1st of the Month.

ANY BOOK sent Carriage Free on receipt of the Published Price.

A CATALOGUE of Books for Lending Libraries, sent for one Stamp.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S SERMON and MANUSCRIPT PAPERS, Ruled and Unruled, are sold in packets of 5 quires, at 1*s.* 3*d.*, 1*s.* 6*d.*, 2*s.*, and 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

SAMPLES sent POST FREE on application.

PAPER RULED TO ANY PATTERN on reasonable terms.

SERMON CASES with Two Pockets, 3*s.* each, post free.

PARCELS OF 20*s.* WORTH sent CARRIAGE FREE to any Railway Station in England.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

Just published, Post free for 7 Stamps.

"WHAT IS PUSEYITE?"

By a LITTLE SPRITE.

JOHN HODGES, Frome Selwood.

THE FIRST VOLUME of the **LIFE** of the **BISHOP OF EXETER** will be **PUBLISHED** in **NOVEMBER**.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Bicentenary Volume.

THE CENTRAL UNITED BARTHOLOMEW COMMITTEE have just published a volume which contains all the public documents of importance, from "The Declaration of Breda" to "The Act of Toleration," that relate to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity in 1562. The documents are collected from the most authentic sources; and being published without note or comment of any kind, they are left to tell their own unbiassed tale. This volume, 516 pp., demy 8vo., printed in a clear handsome type, may be had bound in embossed gilt-lettered cloth, price 4s. 6d., or stitched in paper covers, price 4s.

London: **W. KENT AND CO.**, 23, Paternoster Row; and at the Office of the Committee, 10, Broad Street Buildings, E. C.

Just published, in one Volume, 8vo. 7s. 6d.

PASTORAL LIFE.

PART I.

THE CLERGYMAN AT HOME AND IN THE PULPIT.

BY THE REV EDWARD MONRO, M.A.

*Vicar of St. John the Evangelist, Leeds;
late of Harrow-weald, Middlesex.*

Oxford: **H. HAMMANS**.

London: **JOSEPH MASTERS**.

ROBERT COCKS and Co.'s NEW PIANO-FORTES. Warranted. Price 25l., 35l., and 42l. each.

ORGAN MUSIC. The Second Volume of **W. T. BEST's** Collection of Organ Compositions, Ancient and Modern. 12 Nos., 3s. each; or, Complete, cloth bds. 30s. Lists of Mr. BEST's Works may be had, *gratis* and *post free*.

HALF HOURS at the ORGAN. By **JOHN BISHOP**. 12 books; 3s. each; or in one volume, bound in cloth, 30s.

W. T. BEST'S 130 CHORUSES of HANDEL for Pedal Organs 3l. 3s. Single Choruses at various prices. Contents *gratis* and *post free*.

London: **ROBERT COCKS and Co.**, New Burlington Street, and of all Musicians.

Now ready, the 36th Thousand, Post 8vo. Price 7s. 6d.

SOYER'S MODERN HOUSEWIFE. Comprising Receipts for the Economic and Judicious Preparation of Every Meal of the day, and for the Nursery and Sick Room. By the late **ALEXIS SOYER**. With Illustrations on Wood, &c.

"Should be in the hands of every keeper of a kitchen, and larder in the kingdom."—*Lancet*.

Also, by the same Author,

SOYER'S GASTRONOMIC REGENERATOR; or, System of Cookery for the Kitchens of the Wealthy. With Plates. Ninth Edition, 8vo. 15s. cloth.

London: **SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, and Co.**, Stationers'-Hall Court.

Just published, Price 1s. By Post, 1s. 1d.

THE TEACHER'S OFFICE AN ADMINISTRATION OF THE SPIRIT. A Sermon preached in Winchester Cathedral, on Monday, Oct. 13. 1862, on the occasion of opening the New Diocesan Training College, by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford, Lord High Almoner to the Queen, Chancellor of the Most Noble Order of the Garter.

Published by request.

Oxford and London: **JOHN HENRY and JAMES PARKER**. Winchester: **JACOB and JOHNSTON**.

Now ready, price THREEPENCE, 32 pp. demy 8vo.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEMPERANCE MAGAZINE. No. I, Oct. 1; No. II, Nov. 1.

London: **WEEKS and CO.**, 44, Paternoster Row, E. C.

Works on Theological Subjects,

By **E. C. HARRINGTON, M.A.**

Chancellor and Canon Residentiary of the Cathedral Church of Exeter.

TWO ORDINATION SERMONS, preached in the Cathedral Church of S. Peter, Exeter, and published at the request of the Lord Bishop of Exeter; with copious Notes. 2nd edition.

"The Succession of Bishops in the Church of England Unbroken." 2nd edition.

"The Reformers of the Anglican Church, and Mr. Macaulay's History of England;" with an Appendix. 2nd edition.

"The Purity of the Church of England and the Corruption of the Church of Rome;" a Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of S. Peter, Exeter, November 5th, 1852.

"Rome's Pretensions Tested;" a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of S. Peter, Exeter, November 5th, 1855, with copious Illustrative Notes.

"Pope Pius IV. and the Book of Common Prayer."

"The Bull of Pope Pius IX. and the Ancient British Church."

"The Object, Importance, and Antiquity of the Rite of Consecration of Churches."

"On the Reconsecration, Reconciliation, &c., of Churches," written at the Request of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society.

"Brief Notes on the Church of Scotland."

"The LV. Canon and the Kirk of Scotland;" with an Appendix.

"A Few Words in Reply to the Rev. W. Goode, on the LV. Canon."

"Bradford the Martyr and Sir John Harington;" being a Reply to some Passages in the Rev. Aubrey Townsend's "*Biographical Notice of John Bradford*."

* * *A few sets only, complete in Two Volumes, 8vo., and bound in antique calf, 1l. 11s. 6d.*

Exeter: **WILLIAM CLIFFORD**, High Street.

This Day is published, price Threepence,

TIMOTHY, AN EXAMPLE TO CHRISTIAN CHILDREN.

A SERMON, preached in the Cathedral Church of S. Peter, Exeter; and addressed to the Children of the Episcopal Charity Schools, on the Official Opening of the New Buildings, September 30, 1862, by **CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, B.D.**, Dean of Exeter.

Exeter: **WILLIAM CLIFFORD**, High Street.

London: **PARKER, SON, and BOURN**, West Strand, London.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE,

FOR NOVEMBER 1862. No. DLXV. PRICE 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

CANTONIANA.—PART X.

No. 15.—The Organ of Weight.

No. 16.—The Sympathetic Temperament.

THE SCOT IN FRANCE.

CHRONICLES OF CARLINGFORD: SALEM CHAPEL.—PART X.

CLOUGH'S POEMS.

THE LAND REVENUE OF INDIA.

THIERS ON WATERLOO.

A DEATHLESS LOVE. David Wingate.

THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAN WAR.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS, Edinburgh and London.

PARISH MAGAZINE, conducted by

J. ERSKINE CLARKE, M.A., Derby.

One Penny, Monthly.

Contents of the November Number:—

Joseph Haydn (with Illustration).

The Noble Army of Martyrs (for All Saints' Day).

The Crab (with Illustration).

The Goose Club.

Short Sermon, by Melville H. Scott, B.A., Vicar of Ockbrook.

London: **BELL AND DALDY**, 146, Fleet Street and by order of all Booksellers.

Mudie's Library.

READERS of the best Literature in Town or Country are invited to apply for the current number of "Mudie's Library Circular," and to make their selection of Books for Autumn and Winter reading from the ample Lists contained in its pages.

"These Lists, be it remembered, represent the main sources of the general information now in vogue."—*Saturday Review*.

All the best New Works continue to be added to the Library in large numbers as they appear.

CHARLES EDWARD MUDIE, New Oxford Street, London (City Office, 4, King Street, Cheapside); Cross Street, Manchester; and New Street, Birmingham.

OLD ENGLISH BALLADS.

Just published, in cloth boards, Price 1s. 8d.

A SELECTION of the most interesting Romantic BALLADS, freed from all objectionable expressions. With Historical Introductions, copious Notes, and Explanations.

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S DEPOSITORY, Westminster.

SCRIPTURE GEOGRAPHY.

Just published, with a Map of the Ancient World, printed in Colours, Price 2s.

SCRIPTURE GEOGRAPHY: being an Account drawn from the latest Writings and Discoveries of the more important Countries and Places mentioned in Holy Scripture.

By JAMES HEWITT, late Lecturer on Geography at the Training College, Battersea.

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S DEPOSITORY, Westminster.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

Now Ready, in Seven Parts, Price 2d. each.

OUTLINES of ENGLISH HISTORY, from the Roman Invasion to the year 1714. These Outlines give in brief compass all the most important Historical Events, and are drawn from the most recent and accredited investigations.

By E. DANIEL, Lecturer at the Training College, Battersea.

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S DEPOSITORY, Westminster.

EVENING-SCHOOLS.

Just published, Price 6d., in limp cloth.

A READING-BOOK, for USE in EVENING-SCHOOLS. This Volume has been specially arranged for Youths and Adults, and is printed from a bold, legible type.

NATIONAL SOCIETY'S DEPOSITORY, Westminster.

MMAGIC LANTERNS, with Dissolving-View

Apparatus, and a various Selection of Entertaining and Interesting Slides. Two Pairs of Magic Lanterns, with complete Apparatus for Dissolving-Views, are kept ON HIRE at the National Society's Depository, Sanctuary, Westminster. Applications for hire of the Lanterns, specifying No. 1 or 2, may be addressed to the Secretary, National Society's Depository, Sanctuary, Westminster.

CCHURCH AND STATE REVIEW.

Country Booksellers and Newsagents desirous of having the Contents Bill of the Church and State Review sent them regularly should immediately communicate with the Publishers.

Price 10s. 6d.

A READING COVER to contain the current Numbers of the Church and State Review. It will be large enough to hold six copies, and may be obtained to order of any Bookseller or Newsagent.

NNOTICE. CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW.

Complaints having been made to the Publishers of difficulty in obtaining the Church and State Review, it is respectfully intimated that it can be obtained to order of any respectable Bookseller or Newsagent in the United Kingdoms, AND AT ALL THE RAILWAY BOOKSTALLS.

Christmas Decorations.

PRICE LIST ON APPLICATION.

HARLAND AND FISHER,

33, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

Macmillan & Co's.

LIST OF NEW WORKS.

This day, in 2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 8s., with numerous Illustrations,

PRE-HISTORIC MAN: Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and the New World. By DANIEL WILSON, LL.D., Professor of History and English Literature in University College, Toronto; Author of "The Archaeology and Pre-historic Annals of Scotland," &c.

This day, in crown 8vo. cloth, 5s. 6d.

On MATTER and ETHER; or, The Secret Laws of Physical Change. By the Rev. T. R. BIRKS, Rector of Kelshall; Author of "The Difficulty of Belief," &c.

This day, handsomely printed and bound, 4s. 6d.

The BOOK of PRAISE: from the best English Hymn Writers. Selected and arranged by ROUNDELL PALMER. With Vignette by WOOLNER, engraved by JEENS.

* * This Volume forms one of the "GOLDEN TREASURY SERIES."

Immediately,

A PAINTER'S CAMP in the HIGHLANDS. By P. G. HAMERTON.

This day is published; a New and Cheaper Edition, handsomely printed and bound in extra cloth, with Vignette and Frontispiece on Steel, from Designs by the Author, engraved by C. H. JEENS.

18mo. price 4s. 6d.

The LADY of LA GARAYE. By the Hon. Mrs. NORTON. Dedicated to the Marquis of LANSDOWN.

"The poem is a pure, tender, touching tale of pain, sorrow, love, duty, pity, and death. . . . The moral is unimpeachable, the characters are uniformly good. The melancholy inspired by 'The Lady of La Garaye,' far from being of a depressing kind, is the most soothing, elevated, and hallowing state of feeling which, at seasons of trial, can possess the heart and soul of man."—*Edinburgh Review*.

"Among the Christmas books of the year, we do not believe that there is to be found a volume more beautiful in appearance or more deserving to be read than this."—*Times*.

"Rich in imagery, excellent in versification, and pervaded by a reverential tenderness which is irresistibly touching."—*Daily News*.

This day, with Coloured Illustrations, 8vo. cloth, 14s.

VITI: an Account of a Government Mission to the Viti or Fijian Group. By BERTHOLD SEEMANN, Ph. D. F.L.S.

Immediately, 2 vols. demy 8vo.

HISTORY of FREDERICK the SECOND, EMPEROR of the ROMANS. From Chronicles and Documents published within the last Ten Years. By T. L. KINGTON, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, and the Inner Temple.

* * This Work has an important bearing on the question of our age. It sets before us the causes of the present disunion of Germany; it introduces us to a monarch who, as the promoter of Italian unity, was honoured with the especial enmity of the Papacy.

This day, handsomely printed and bound, 4s. 6d.

BACON'S ESSAYS and COLOURS of GOOD and EVIL. With Notes and Glossarial Index by W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. With a Vignette after Woolner's Statue of Bacon.

* * This Volume forms part of the "GOLDEN TREASURY SERIES."

This day, 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

An ELEMENTARY HISTORY of the PRAYER-BOOK. By FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A.; Vicar of Witton, Norfolk, formerly Fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge.

Immediately, in 2 vols. crown 8vo.

The TWO CATHERINES. A Novel.

LONDON and CAMBRIDGE.

Now ready, in 8vo. price 9s. 6d.

A Review of the Baptismal Controversy.

BY J. B. MOZLEY, B.D.

Vicar of Old Shoreham, late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place.

Now ready, in 8vo., Price 6d.

CASE WHETHER PROFESSOR JOWETT IN HIS ESSAY AND COMMENTARY

Has so distinctly contravened the Doctrines of the Church of England, that a Court of Law would pronounce him Guilty;

WITH THE OPINION OF THE QUEEN'S ADVOCATE THEREON.

London: RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place.

Messrs. J. H. & J. Parker's

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

OXFORD AND LONDON.

The PRINCIPLES of DIVINE SERVICE: or, an Inquiry concerning the True Manner of understanding and using the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Vicar of Thorverton, Prebendary of Exeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Exeter. In two vols. 8vo. cloth, price 1*l.* 4*s.* [Just published.]

The concluding portion, on the Order for the Holy Communion, just published, besides its proper subject, enters incidentally into most of the great religious questions of the day; as Atonement, Sacrifice, the Origin of the Sabbath Day, &c.

For those who have Vol. I., the price of Vol. II., with Introduction will be 14*s.*; without the Introduction, 8*s.*

The ORDINATION SERVICE. Addresses on the Questions to the Candidates for Ordination. By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6*s.*

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. The Greek Testament, with English Notes. By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. Sixth Edition, with Index. 8vo. cloth, price 10*s.* 6*d.* [Just published.]

UNIVERSITY and CATHEDRAL SERMONS. By the late DAVID WILLIAMS, D.C.L., Warden of New College, Oxford, and Canon of Winchester, formerly Head Master of Winchester College. With a brief Memoir of the Author. In one vol. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

SEVEN SERMONS preached on the Sundays in Lent and Easter-day, 1862. By GILBERT VYVYAN HEATNCOTE, Literate Priest; Curate in sole charge of Rushall, Diocese of Salisbury. Crown 8vo. limp cloth, price 2*s.* 6*d.*

REPORT of the PROCEEDINGS of the CHURCH CONGRESS of 1862, held in the Sheldonian Theatre and Town-hall, Oxford, July 8th, 9th, and 10th. 8vo. sewed, price 2*s.* 6*d.*; by post 2*s.* 10*d.* [Just published.]

A HISTORY of the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER and other Authorized Books, from the Reformation; and an attempt to ascertain how the Rubrics, Canons, and Customs of the Church have been understood and observed from the same time; with an Account of the State of Religion in England from 1640 to 1660. By the Rev. THOMAS LATIMER, M.A., Author of "A History of the Convocation," "The Nonjurors," &c. Second Edition, with an Index. 8vo. price 10*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

ANCIENT COLLECTS and other PRAYERS. Selected for devotional use from various Rituals, with an Appendix on the Collects in the Prayer-Book. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford, Author of "A History of the Church," &c. Second Edition, enlarged. Fcap. 8vo. in red and black, on toned paper, price 5*s.* antique cloth.

The WORKS of S. JUSTIN MARTYR. Translated with Notes and Indices. (Library of the Fathers.) In 8vo. cloth, price 8*s.*

THOUGHTS DURING SICKNESS. By the Author of "The Doctrine of the Cross," and "Devotions for the Sick Room." Third Edition. Fcap. price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

JELF'S GREEK GRAMMAR. A Grammar of the Greek Language, chiefly from the Text of Raphael Kühnner. By Wm. EDW. JELF, M.A., Student of Christ Church. Two vols. 8vo. Third Edition, price 1*l.* 10*s.*

This Grammar is now in general use at Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, and Durham; at Eton, King's College, London, and other public Schools.

MADVIG'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Latin Grammar for the use of Schools. By Professor MADVIG, with Additions by the Author. Translated by the Rev. G. F. WOODS, M.A., uniform with Jelf's "Greek Grammar." Fourth Edition, with an Index of Authors. 8vo. price 12*s.* cloth.

Competent authorities pronounce this work to be the very best Latin Grammar yet published in England. This New Edition contains an Index to the Authors quoted.

GLEANINGS FROM WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By GEORGE GILBERT SCOTT, R.A., F.S.A. With Appendices supplying further particulars, and completing the History of the Abbey Buildings, by others. Illustrated by numerous Plates and Woodcuts. New and much enlarged Edition. 8vo. [In the press.]

MEMOIR of the late JOSHUA WATSON. By the Venerable ARCHDEACON CHURTON. New Edition. [In the press.]

LIFE of THOMAS WILSON, D.D., Bishop of Sodor and Man. By the Rev. JOHN KEBLE. [In the press.]

Oxford; and 377, Strand, London: J. H. and J. PARKER.

Works in the Press.

The INVASION of the CRIMEA: its Origin, and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By ALEXANDER WILLIAM KINGLAKE, M.P. Vols. I. and II., bringing the Events down to the Close of the BATTLE of the ALMA.

To be completed in Four Volumes, 8vo.

Illustrated Edition.

PROFESSOR ATOUN'S LAYS of the SCOTTISH CAVALIERS, with Seventy Illustrations designed by JOSEPH NOEL PATON, R.S.A.; and WALLER H. PATON.

The Second Volume of

The ODYSSEY of HOMER. Translated into English Verse in the Spenserian Stanza. By PHILLIP STANHOPE WORSLEY, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College. Containing Books XIII. to XXIV. [Ready.]

In one Volume, Octavo,

STUDIES in ROMAN LAW, with Comparative Views of the Laws of France, England, and Scotland. By LORD MACKENZIE, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland.

A Cheap Edition of

PROFESSOR WILSON'S NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ. Illustrated with Portraits. In Twelve Monthly Parts, price One Shilling each.

A Cheap Edition of

The MILL on the FLOSS. By GEORGE ELIOT. [Complete in One Volume, price 6*s.*

TEXT-BOOKS of PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY.

By DAVID PAGE, F.G.S. Author of "Text-books of Geology," the "Past and Present Life of the Globe," &c.

I.

INTRODUCTORY TEXT-BOOK. With Illustrations and Glossarial Index. Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 9*d.*

II.

ADVANCED TEXT-BOOK. With Illustrations and Glossary of Terms. Crown 8vo.

INDEX GEOGRAPHICUS: being an Index to nearly One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Names of Places, &c. with their Latitudes and Longitudes as given in KEITH JOHNSTON'S ROYAL ATLAS. Together with the Countries and Subdivisions of the Countries in which they are situated. In One Large Volume, 8vo.

LIFE of the REV. JAMES ROBERTSON, D.D., F.R.S.E., Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History in the University of Edinburgh. By the Rev. A. H. CHARRIS, M.A., Minister of Newabbey.

The BOOK of JOB. By the late Rev. GEORGE CROLY, D.D., Rector of St. Stephen's, Walbrook.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS,
Edinburgh and London.

Church and State Review.

No. 7, Vol. I.

December 1, 1862.

Price 1s.

The Bishop of Natal and the Word of God.*

SOME two hundred years ago "flourished" Benoît de Spinoza. About this time began "the manhood of the world."† The biographer of Spinoza—"chef des Panthéistes modernes"—after enlarging upon the suavity of his demeanour and the courtesies of his address, and the influence which he obtained and exercised thereby over ardent and unwary minds, proceeds to say:—

"Mais, sous des mœurs si douces, Spinoza cachait des projets hostiles contre les anciennes croyances. Dans sa solitude il travaillait à un *Traité Theologico-Politique*, qui devait affranchir les hommes du joug d'autorité pour les préparer à recevoir celui de sa doctrine. Il y soumit la Bible à une nouvelle analyse, dans le but de saper les bases de la Révélation. Il exposa ses doutes sur l'authenticité des Livres Saints, sur la mission de Moïse, sur l'esprit des prophètes, sur la possibilité des miracles; et il chercha les preuves de ces assertions dans la Bible elle-même, sur laquelle il prétendait que chacun avait le droit de raisonner à sa manière."

Spinoza was ~~thus~~ a considerable unbeliever, but he was not a Bishop. The Rt. Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D. is the Bishop of Natal. The latest manifestation of the world's mature age is that of a Bishop sitting in his chair at the altar of his Cathedral Church with young Christian men seeking the office of Deacon at his hands, standing before him. In his right hand is his own book denying the truth of the Bible: in his left is the Bible, as he declared himself "unfeignedly" to "believe" it in *his own* ordination. Out of his mouth come the words demanding, as a condition of *their* ordination, "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?"

The whole thing is almost too revolting to touch. Especially is it revolting to touch the sophistry wherewith the Bishop in his preface undertakes to show that it is competent to him, as an honest man, to continue to minister, and to ordain others to

minister, in the Church of England. We fear that there are many signs to show that these are not days of a high morality. But was there ever an instance of a lower morality, or of a more appalling self-condemnation?

We have, however, no choice. We dare not pass these things by here or elsewhere; though we will not allow the blasphemous book of this arithmetical unbeliever to be reviewed in this *Review*. The Bishop is well known as a considerable arithmetician. His powers of calculation have been too much for his faith. Verily, *il a raisonné à sa manière*.

It is a day of poisonings: but there are worse things in the world than strychnine. For the last two years a man has had it in his power, and now has it in his power more than ever, to go a long way to destroy not the life of the body, but everything that makes it worth having, for himself, and for all those whom God has given him to influence and guide, by laying out a few shillings at Messrs. Longmans. Weak as the poison is, and dishonouring to the intellect in whose prostituted name it is administered, it is yet strong enough to do its deadly work where there is a predisposition of the mind. The silliness, therefore, of books like *Essays and Reviews*, and this book of the Bishop of Natal, is no ground for passing them by as things too foolish to do much mischief. No doubt they *are* very foolish books, and, as fruits of an educated and "manly" intellect, contemptible. No doubt they are weak reproductions of many times exploded heresies. But it is not only original power and much learning and clever writing that is able to ruin souls.

The sin of "the Church of England by representation" has not been slow to find her out. Two years ago six priests and one layman published *Essays and Reviews*. The Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was with much difficulty persuaded to do its duty. The Upper House has not done its duty. There has been an irregular and unauthoritative declaration of a private meeting of the Bishops of both Provinces at Lambeth; but there has been no Judgment in Synod.

The sin—for it is no less—has borne fruit, and the Church is visited with a deeper curse. The sin of the Synod is the rebuke of the Church. That men are, in the plenitude of conceit of their own reason, impatient and despisers of authority, is no

H

* *The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined.* By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green. 1862.

† See *Essays and Reviews*. Rev. Frederic Temple, D.D., Essay I.; Rev. Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Essay VII.—*passim*.

excuse, or even palliation, for abandoning authority. If there be members of the Church of England who have no regard to, or respect for, the sentence of the Synod, when such sentence has been pronounced, the sin is theirs. But, so long as no sentence is pronounced, the sin is the sin of the Synod. The offence and the folly of *Essays and Reviews* have culminated in the book of the Bishop of Natal. The use which the Bishop has made (Preface, p. xii. note) of the late judgments in the Court of Arches—Bishop of Salisbury *v.* Williams; Fendall *v.* Wilson;—will open some men's eyes to the unsoundness and the danger of the position that the Synod may and ought to leave such cases to the law Courts. For the judgments in the Court of Arches may be sound enough, as discriminating between what is, and what is not, a legal offence: but a legal offence in a minister of a Church established by law, and an offence of the same man against the Bible and the Church, are not, necessarily, one and the same thing. Neither are they to be dealt with in the same way. Meantime, the book is a judgment upon us all for the evasion by the Bishops of a primary duty of their Synodical office. The evasion, so long as it is not repaired, converts all other proceedings in Synod into an offence.

Bishops and priests, members of the Church's Synods, what are you going to say to this "hinderer and slanderer of God's Word?" Are you going to shrink from condemning his book as you shrunk from condemning *Essays and Reviews*? Are you going, once more, to abdicate the "Authority" entrusted to you by the Great Head of the Church in favour of the argumentative refutations of private men? Is there no room for application here of the Divine reproof,—“These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone?” Will you again invite the application? May God in His mercy forbid! Rather may God enlarge the concord now prevailing between faithful members of His Church in this land who had doubted of one another, and may He bless that concord to the recovery of the Church's true position in the defence of the common inheritance of the Faith. For the Church may sin, either in the life of its members severally, or in its corporate life. The sin of its corporate life is the refusal or the neglect to guard the Faith committed to its keeping, and to interpose the shield of its Authority, and the encouragement of its own humble faithfulness, between the tempter and the tempted.

Let us hope—and let us pray that we may hope—that, notwithstanding our painful experience in the case of *Essays and Reviews*, the Synod will be ready to postpone all other business to the consideration of a Synodical judgment to be pronounced upon this most unhappy book of one of the Bishops of the Church of England. “To what purpose is the multitude” of ministers, and churches, and schools, and the work of home and foreign missions; to what purpose is “the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments,” if ministers and teachers are to go forth bearing in their hands a doubted and dishonoured BIBLE?

Garibaldi.



ARIBALDI has obtained a great and permanent success upon the stage of foreign politics. Sympathy with his late reverses, notwithstanding the Conservative tendencies of the age, is a popular text for dinner and platform orators; and in the race for the favour of the British public the revolutionary chief has fairly distanced his competitors. All parties yield alike to the fascination of his romance. His professed opinions endear him to the Radicals; the support he has given to those proceedings which her Majesty's Government dignify with the title of a foreign policy commend him to the Whigs; and even Tory county members and Tory country gentlemen rise, amidst the fumes of provincial dinners, to drink “success to Garibaldi,” with as much enthusiasm and far less logic than their ancestors may have toasted the “king over the water.” Under these circumstances we may reasonably ask, “Whence comes such wonderful unanimity of opinion?” One answer is obvious. The misgovernment of the Bourbon dynasty had become proverbial amongst us; we welcomed the Neapolitan refugee, no matter how infamous his character or conduct, as a martyr and a hero. When therefore Garibaldi, at the head of a thousand volunteers, landed in Sicily, worsted the royal troops, passed over to the sister kingdom in the face of a powerful fleet, entered the capital without a blow, defeated the King in a pitched battle, and, having wrested from him the greater part of his dominions, proclaimed Victor Emmanuel in Naples apparently without fee, reward, or condition, no wonder that enthusiasm ran high, no wonder that the author of such miraculous results was almost adored! But has not Garibaldi a further claim on British sympathy? Is he not the avowed enemy of the Pope? Is not it his mission to root out Romish superstition and enthrone pure religion on the Seven Hills? So reason many of our pious countrymen—excellent, but credulous men! When they reflect that Garibaldi attends no fixed place of worship, professes at the best a very doubtful Christianity,—when they peruse the “Garibaldi” catechism, can they believe that the renegade clerical adventurers, who are dubbed his chaplains, would establish any orthodox creed if the supreme ecclesiastical power fell into their hands? This test must be resigned: Garibaldi's reputation must stand or fall by his political acts only, and to judge whether he deserves the confidence and admiration which have been lavished upon him, let us briefly review the circumstances attending his first expedition to Sicily.

In the month of December, 1859, Cavour, who had lately returned to power, determined to compensate for the certain surrender of Savoy and Nice by striking a blow at Naples. The opportunity was favourable; Ferdinand was dead; his weak and youthful successor no formidable opponent. In the first instance Cavour felt his way independently of the republican party; he selected as his instrument one Nisco, who had been lately liberated from political imprisonment under the amnesty proclaimed by Francis on his accession.

Cavour's plan was to bribe the Neapolitan army; and Nisco, furnished with a large sum of money, opened negotiations, first with General Nunziante, and later with the Prince of Syracuse, the King's uncle. The Prince and the General were the only fruits of Nisco's mission, which in other respects proved a failure, but the pair of traitors retired to Turin, to receive the reward of their treachery; the Prince an ample pension, the General a high command in the Piedmontese army, and subsequently the governorship of Alexandria. Our readers will perhaps remember the letter addressed on the 24th August, 1860, by the Prince of Syracuse to his nephew, urging the cession of Naples; and will readily appreciate the motives by which it was dictated. Finding simple corruption of no avail, Cavour, in March, 1860, had recourse to another expedient. The late disgraceful surrender of Nice and Savoy had incensed the party of action against his government; and to regain their allegiance, as well as to forward his own policy, Cavour assented to Garibaldi's expedition against Sicily. We cannot attempt here an elaborate recital of these intrigues; but the admission of Cavour's own agents, and the debates in the Turin Chambers, have given to the world all the leading details.

The owners of the vessel which conveyed Garibaldi to Marsala were compensated by the government; the arms carried by the volunteers were furnished from a Piedmontese fortress; Admiral Persano convoyed this expedition, with orders to resist any attacking force, and carried on board his flagship the Piedmontese *Lafarina* (afterwards Governor of Sicily), and Count Trecchi, King Victor Emmanuel's confidential aide-de-camp; the volunteers who reinforced the expedition were franked to the seaports, drilled, and shipped at the government expense, and Piedmontese soldiers disguised in red shirts were frequent in their ranks. On the 4th August the Piedmontese "*statuto*" was proclaimed by Depretis, and subsequently the government of the island was administered, in the name of Victor Emmanuel, by a staff of officials sent from Turin.

On the 8th of September Persano anchored at Naples, and landed Piedmontese regiments to strengthen the "*Liberator*." Thenceforward the mask was thrown off, and the Piedmontese army took the offensive in sober earnest.

By their exertions the successes of Volturno, Isernia, and Garigliano were gained, and Gaeta invested, and finally, on the 7th of November, Victor Emmanuel, styled in irony *Il re Galantuomo*, entered the capital of his kinsman and ally, after a series of acts of duplicity and treachery which have few historical parallels. Garibaldi's part for the time was played. On the 9th he retired to Caprera, and took leave of his comrades in these words, "To arms all! all! If the month of March, 1861, does not find a million of Italians under arms, alas for Italian existence."

The month of March came, but brought no million of armed Italians. For the most part they were sick of fighting. The squabbles of the representative chamber, and the influence of Cavour for a time checked the party of action, but the accession to power of Ricasoli was the signal for renewed action. Garibaldi and his friends disliked the Tuscan

noble, Ricasoli; they remembered his support of the Grand Duke, in 1849, and suspected him of Conservative tendency; they therefore opened a negotiation with the French party to act against the common foe, and on the promise of a million of francs, Garibaldi sealed the compact. Ricasoli fell. Rattazzi succeeded, the money was paid, but the Republicans obtained no further share of the spoil; no support in their schemes of aggression; and the fruits of their disappointment resulted in the abortive attempt at Sarnico and in the humiliation and capture of their chief at Aspromonte.

From the facts above mentioned we see at a glance the cause of Garibaldi's late failure. Garibaldi is a brave soldier, an able partisan leader, but without Piedmontese assistance he never could have hoped for success in 1860. Consequently, in 1862, when the Government went against him, the sinews of war were wanting, and so the bubble burst, this house of cards fell to the ground.

We also learn another truth, new to some of us, namely, that the great high minded patriot is but a frail mortal, capable of very common-place intrigues, and of playing fast and loose with rival politicians. His motives are clear enough. He seeks Italian unity, but through the Italian Republic one and indivisible. The cry of "*Victor Emmanuel*" was raised only to further an ulterior object to be thrown aside when the *Triumvirate* should be proclaimed in the Capitol with the party of action at the head of affairs. If Italy is ever to become a great and strong power, and induce France and Austria to restore her unity, she cannot accomplish her desire at the hands of revolutionary adventurers. Her statesmen must trace the paths of moderation, reform the internal administration of the country, put a stop to wholesale military massacre and political imprisonment, raise states of siege, obtain a fair representation of property and intelligence in the Lower Chamber, to the exclusion of the mass of adventurers who now crowd the benches, and above all, abandon for the present any attempt at territorial aggrandisement.

May we also venture to hope that Englishmen will see through the political mist which surrounds them, and exchange a region of romance for a few grains of common sense. We may justly admire Garibaldi, his indomitable courage, his fertile resources, his skilful dispositions; but supporters of our ancient institutions, of our Church and State, may not choose for a hero one who has done his best to damage the monarchical form of government in Italy, and who, with his latest political breath, approves the events of 1793, and advocates the worship of the goddess of reason.

The Meeting at Wycombe.



HAT the recent Meeting at High Wycombe, at which the leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons spoke at large on the prospects of the Church of England, should have been very unfavourably criticised by all who are jealous of the Church was only to have been expected. Such criticism, indeed, is the best tribute to the real significance of the meeting, and

betrays the alarm which is inspired, in certain quarters, by evidence of a cordial reunion between all "denominations" of Churchmen. This consummation has been gradually drawing nearer and nearer, as the estrangement of that statesman, whose pride it once was to represent the interests of the clergy, from his early friends has become more and more pronounced. The open manifestation of a sceptical spirit within the Church herself has drawn together many faithful members of her body who had suspected one another, and has quickened the growth of Conservative feeling. And these two causes, working perhaps together with the general Conservative reaction of the last three years, have brought about a result on which we warmly congratulate our readers.

We may say, we trust without any fear of giving offence, that the Bishop of Oxford, Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Walpole, who were the chief speakers at High Wycombe, represent, if not different parties in the Church, parties at least who have often regarded the Church of England from different points of view, and have differed as to the best means of promoting her temporal interests. The Churchmen represented by the Bishop of Oxford have not always been unanimous in their sympathy with that party of which Mr. Disraeli is the leader. Between Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Walpole conscientious differences of opinion have been acknowledged to exist. Now, however, all these differences have been merged in a common resolution to fall back upon that ancient alliance between the Church and the Conservatives which has been the surest support of both, and, through them, of the Constitution. Churchmen have awakened to the fact that, as we live under a Parliamentary Government, the temporal position of the Church can only be secured against attack not by the zeal of individuals, but by the steady resistance of a disciplined political party. And Conservatives have awakened to the fact that, as the Church of England is at the present day the most exposed part of the Constitution, their duty, and therefore their interest, lies in concentrating their energies upon this side of their position. More than this, all men of generous and elevated sentiments must feel the force of another truth not long since spoken by Mr. Disraeli. "There are," said he, "but few great things left, and the Church of England is one of them. The defence of an institution like the Church would lend dignity to any creed, and might inspire with enthusiasm even men who cared little for religion. Whatever may hitherto have occurred to sow dissension between the Tories and the Church, now that the breach is healed, what statesman can fail to appreciate the moral weight of the connection, or can set limits to the success which may now be in store for the Conservatives under the banner of their ancient ally?"

It is the prompt comprehension of this posture of affairs, and all the fruits which it may bear, that has sharpened the energies of Dissenters, and troubled the self-complacency of Radicals. What if, after all, there *should* be some truth in this oft-desired Conservative reaction—in this much contemned Anglican revival? Like Napoleon at Waterloo, insisting that Blucher was only Grouchy, even against the evidence of his senses, so do these

unhappy men still protest that Dissent is on the increase, and the Conservative party an imposture. Like Pope reading Dennis's lampoons, they smile a ghastly smile at the speeches of bishops and statesmen, and profess that "these things are their diversion." The *Times*, for instance, abusing, as it always does, the misplaced credulity of its readers, thinks to gull us by repeating that the Archbishop of Canterbury thought the people had outgrown the Church, while neglecting to repeat the pendant to this same assertion, that he subsequently changed his opinion. The same journal, too, can find nothing ready to its hand but to quote the fraudulent statistics of 1851, as to the number of Churchmen and Dissenters, though aware all the time that these figures have not only been disproved, but that their deceptiveness has been generally acknowledged. Truly such resistance as this is a virtual admission of defeat.

A comparison is invidiously drawn in the same leading article between the "visions" of Mr. Disraeli and the practical suggestions of Mr. Walpole. Mr. Walpole's suggestions are no doubt practical: but they are only the realization of Mr. Disraeli's visions. The mistake so frequently made by the enemies of the English Church, deliberately or otherwise, is that Dissent in England is still propped up by some two or three great causes, instead of by a multitude of little ones. Questions of Church government, or the true nature of a Christian life, are no longer the mainsprings of Dissent. There is among us now none of that hatred of prelacy which animated the first Puritans; none of that re-action against worldliness which inspired the disciples of John Wesley. Even aversion to Church-rates, be it remembered, is a consequence of Dissent, not a cause of it. It can neither make nor keep a man Dissenter. If Church-rates be in any man's mind the sole ground of his nonconformity, the remedy is in his own hands. Let him conform. No—the streamlets by which the great river Dissent is swollen, at the present day, are of a very different character from these. Grievances it has none. It subsists upon the force of its traditions, by political and social jealousies, and by certain local habits. But a religious confederation which has no other standing-ground than these must assuredly die away in time, if means are not taken to procure recruits by unwearied proselytism. A large proportion of Dissenters is every year reabsorbed into the Church, and the vacuum must be filled up by a perpetual succession of converts, or the schism would perish of atrophy. Now, how are these recruits procured? Why, in country districts, at all events, by the exact means that we have mentioned: by incessant proselytism brought to bear on helpless ignorance. Here, then, we see the practical value of two of Mr. Disraeli's suggestions. So educate the rising generation that they shall be beyond reach of the shallow sophistries which are employed to seduce them from the Church: and so increase the number of the clergy that they shall have time to detect and counteract the organized proselytism which is at work in every parish in the kingdom.

As long as any clergymen are left with the wide rambling parishes which exist at present, consisting perhaps of scattered hamlets, and a very numerous

population, this kind of evil is incurable. The garrison is too small for the fortress. But let every collected population of four or five hundred people have a clergyman in the midst of them who is able to watch over his parishioners, even in their own homes, and to investigate the meaning of suspicious symptoms at their very first appearance, and the Dissenters' propaganda must be extinguished.

Take, again, the proposed increase of the Episcopate, another of what the *Times* would have us think Mr. Disraeli's visionary projects. Why, few things are more wanted at the present day than a greater efficiency of Church discipline, and a greater admixture of the learned as distinct from the purely pastoral class of bishops. People are in the habit of supposing that public opinion has been sufficient to purify the Church of those negligent or immoral clergy who do so much to diminish her influence. That an improvement has taken place in this respect we are as willing as we are happy to allow. But the state of the clergy in many of the dioceses of this country is far from what it ought to be. And although an increase in the number of bishops would not remove the difficulty or lessen the expense of depriving a scandalous incumbent, it would operate in two ways to diminish the number of such offenders. It would enable every bishop to make himself better acquainted with the antecedent characters of those clergymen who designed to officiate in his diocese. While, on the other hand, it would bring every resident clergyman within range of the episcopal eye, and would cause his doings to be more publicly known, and his shortcomings to be more frequently noticed, than is possible at present. The extent of their dioceses is, in fact, to the bishops much what the extent of their parishes is to rectors and vicars. It prevents that knowledge of individuals which is essential to good discipline, and it overwhelms with mechanical work, which leaves but little time for spiritual exhortations or remonstrances. Again, it is of the last importance that there should be the means of holding Confirmations for every separate parish in the church of that parish. With all the increase of care and energy now so marked in our bishops, this is scarcely, as dioceses are at present, among things possible. That these defects have a direct tendency if not to increase at least to check the diminution of Dissent, surely no man in his senses will deny. In the second place, the very same pressure of administrative business which overwhelms the fathers of the Church, and in a lesser degree the class from which these are chosen, prevents them from taking that lead in theological literature which the interests of the Church require. And it is not only the direct refutation of heretical theories as often as they reappear among us, which is impaired by these circumstances—the Church loses that prestige which attaches to a learned body in the eyes of the world at large; and the authoritative censure, which is a far higher thing than this argumentative one, loses weight. This fact alone is of incalculable importance when we would sum up the causes which combine to propagate Nonconformity. It lessens that feeling of inferiority which the Dissenting community once experienced. It deprives our most

accomplished young men of one of those attractions which the priesthood formerly held out to them, and thus by a reactionary process augments again the dearth of good lances among the champions of the Christian faith.

All such points as these have to be most carefully considered by those who are entrusted with the task of regaining the lost ground of the Church. They cannot be disposed of by a flippant leading article, written probably by a journalist who has never given even an hour's consideration to the subject, and whose instructions have been to disguise the real uneasiness of his employers, and their inability to find a single argument, under a mask of levity and derision. But—

“*Hei mihi quam durum est imitari gaudia falsa !*”

The *Times* has failed conspicuously in the effort; and we have a strong conviction that Dissenters and malcontents of all kinds, when they read the report of the meeting, and then look at the only reply which their champion could bring into the field, must feel that the game is up, that the tide is turned, and that the victory which they fancied they had all but won is gone from their grasp.

Greece.

REECE by her revolution has naturalized herself amongst nations. She has set up a landmark of progress by her moderation, and given a pledge to futurity by her sensible repudiation of an unreal dynasty. Greece owed no allegiance to her late King beyond that involved in the observance of a contract. Good government, paternal solicitude, legitimate ambition and rightly directed energies, would have secured national advancement, filial gratitude, genuine enthusiasm, and enlightened obedience. No nation more than the Greek displays, under an able chief, the qualities of clanship. Great natural intelligence and a sufficient appreciation of the good things of life would have ensured implicit obedience to a wise leader whose conduct indicated any chance of advancement. A Greek does not covet political power if it be employed by his rulers for his benefit. He is content with his olive groves and his vineyard, his counting house and his *trabacolo*, so long as the ruler to whom power is delegated shows him a fair prospect that his interests are secure and his future promising. But a Greek wants his governors to work for him, to discharge the duties for which they are paid. Provided this be done he does not care much for active liberty, and looks upon the franchise as a trouble, the advantages of which are so remote as to be unmarketable. He does not like paying taxes, and will not do so unless compelled; but when the screw is put on, the money is, somehow or other, forthcoming, and he is not very much annoyed with the state creditor who forces him to discharge his state liabilities. He reverences authority, and all the more when firmly or even severely exercised; but authority must be wise, farsighted, and beneficent—mild in appearance, if not in reality. Where an Englishman resents interference the Greek courts it. Nothing can be done without the initiation of Go-

vernment. This once secured, the Greek will faithfully and intelligently follow the lead and even improve on it. To those who know anything of Greece it is patent that the shortcomings of that country are wholly and exclusively attributable to the late King and Queen. With regard to the deposed, we should, if possible, follow the canon established for the dead—chronicle their virtues and be silent on their faults. Such a course in this case would involve absolute silence. Of their private merits we may speak in terms of commendation. The termination of their dynasty is the best commentary of their public career. They have met with no violence as they have created no party. They have left no name and they excite no sympathy.

Yet few men and few women have enjoyed the same opportunities of greatness as Otho and Amelia. Had they been endowed with one grain of pure patriotism or sensible ambition, had they possessed a tithe of King Leopold's political sagacity, the Empire of the East would not now be a dream, nor the expulsion of the infidel from Christendom an hypothesis. But the Ex-King and Queen displayed no single quality for the rule of an impulsive and scarce regenerate race. A Teuton was called to reign over Greeks, the scion of an inland race to guide the destinies of a maritime community, the disciple of a military code to supervise the inauguration of a new civilization. In Germany if the hand be velvet the glove is iron. In Greece if the hand be iron it must be concealed in velvet of the most approved softness; the pile must not be damaged by the roughest usage nor from the hardest blow. In no respect did the Sovereign understand his people. Transplanted from a land of Glyptotheks and Pinacotheks he mistook the results for the causes of civilization. Mental culture was offered where material appliances were indispensable. Ladies-in-waiting and German entomologists were paid with the salaries which should have supported engineers. A palace was built while roads should have been cut. Busts and statues were carved with the treasure which should have opened harbours, drained fields, and constructed bridges. Worse than all, the funds which would have gained the confidence of Europe by the payment of just debts were squandered on insurrections and filibustering incursions which possessed no one element of success, and on the corruption of individuals, through whom it was vainly attempted to stultify a constitution dishonestly withheld, reluctantly extorted, and systematically perverted. It is no trifling ground for praise that the Greeks have for thirty years known all this, that they have suffered the contumely of Europe, and that they have not before this taken the step that has now done so much to redeem the past. They have displayed in an eminent degree the qualities of patience and moderation. With prudence to guide them in an onward direction they may fairly anticipate the partial realization of their hopes. They have a right to count on the sympathy and even the indulgence of their fellow beings, if this revolution, their first act of self-assertion, prove to be the inauguration of a new career, promoted in the same spirit of political wisdom. Already have the Greeks of London, Manchester, and Marseilles taken steps to

re-establish their national credit on the basis which all nations must desire, and which they can all achieve.

To accomplish the regeneration of Greece, to assure for her, or to restore to her, that position in Europe to which she has a claim, the first essential is her choice of a Sovereign. The Greeks are deficient in the constructive or initiative quality. The obstacles to self-government are greater even than this peculiar drawback. They possess great insight into individual character, but are not strong in the art of discrimination. In the same manner they are great in individual intellect, but wholly devoid of combination, of that gift which unites different minds and energies in one work, parcelling out subdivided tasks, and reducing varied results to a common and harmonious object. The bundle of sticks is a fable they are incapable of realizing, especially if one stick happens to be longer, thicker, or stronger than its fellows. The spirit which ostracized Aristides is livelier amongst them than of old. Each man strives for power and pre-eminence, not alone for his own advancement, but from a jealousy of the preponderance of his neighbour. Long years of subjugation have destroyed mutual confidence, if it ever existed. Personal vanity and domestic ties are strong. Love of country and national pride are, perhaps, stronger: but in no country is it so difficult for a man to create for himself a renown above his equals, to raise himself above the level at which widely-spread intelligence places the masses, and to which it reduces the superior few. Instances abound in illustration of this peculiarity. They may be found in the animosity which ended in the assassination of Capod'Istria, and to the Constitutional provision whereby a monarchy was debarred from one of its fundamental prerogatives in the creation of an aristocracy, and the distribution of titles. The Greeks were content to place a foreign Sovereign at the head of their Government, but they would not allow that Sovereign to raise any one of his subjects on a pedestal higher than the lowest of the community.

From these national characteristics, it will be gathered how difficult or even impossible would be the task of a Sovereign selected from the Greek race. It is asserted that such a choice would be the most agreeable to the Great Powers interested in Greek affairs. If so, we find an additional illustration of the small wisdom with which human affairs are regulated. Greece, with a Greek King would start afresh with a fresh millstone, weighed down by every element of discord. Yet the choice of a Sovereign is so much hedged round by prejudice, misgiving, and mistrust, that the Greeks, if they listen to diplomacy, are imprisoned within the limits of negation. Germany has been tried and failed. England, France, and Russia are under the ban of a fundamental veto. Italy is Roman Catholic and her princes are minors. The Count of Flanders, we are told, is shut out by his father's will. Where then is Greece to look for a Sovereign?

If it be difficult to find a Sovereign, it is an easier task to point out the qualities such a Sovereign must present. He must be the converse of Otho, and this moderate merit would of itself ensure a certain amount of success. But to render Greece what her

admirers claim for her, her monarch must possess qualities far more positive; varied acquirements and a noble aim. The princes of this generation have received an education far different from that bestowed on Otho and his contemporaries. Extensive travel, access to great men, practical acquaintance with science, simplicity of manner and disdain of useless state, have been grafted on those accomplishments in which princes have never been lacking. The new King of Greece must be ready to turn his hand to any branch of administration, must be fertile in suggestion and ready in resource. Like the governor of one of our colonies, he must teach his people to respect their Constitution rather than create a party for himself. He must impart to them the rudiments of administration, the theory as well as the practice of laws. He must maintain the authority and the responsibility of his ministers, while for himself he must secure a reputation for sound judgment and varied expedient, open impartially to those whom the nation may choose as his counsellors. Simple in tastes, frugal in habits, and accessible to all, he must limit his expenditure to the bare necessities of royal life, seeking to maintain his dignity rather by a worthy support of public works and adequate charity, than by ostentatious festivities or irrelevant parade. In the conduct of his government he will find fields for ambition sufficient to occupy the most active enterprise. It would not be inconsistent with his position to place himself at the head of great industrial and commercial undertakings; to develop the capabilities of his country, and to open the path of mutual confidence and generous co-operation. Finance, public communications, commerce, and the whole structure of foreign and domestic affairs will be open to his criticism and control even in the minutest detail. He need not fear that his power, if legitimately exercised, will be circumscribed by undue restrictions. His correspondence with foreign courts, his acquaintance with foreign statesmen, his personal alliances and his access to recondite information will create for him an influence which in Europe even despotic sovereigns often find beyond their reach. In the Ionian Islands it is well known that the private opinion and even the public decision of the British authorities are sought for in matters often beyond their jurisdiction, even by those most opposed to the continuance of our domination. A sovereign of Greece able and ready to work would find his labours perhaps too onerous, his powers more extensive than he himself would probably desire. It is easy to foresee how great would be the European influence of any man with real weight of character.

But, after all, we must return to the practical consideration, "Where is Greece to find her man?" It is beyond a doubt that the choice of Greece will fall unanimously on Prince Alfred. Doubtless this choice will be the best for Europe and ourselves. It is preposterous to imagine that the birth of a sovereign can influence his policy to the prejudice of European order. Prince Alfred on the throne of Greece would satisfy the exigencies of his subjects and would pave the way to the settlement of the Ionian question, which is neither creditable nor profitable to ourselves nor

apparently susceptible of any other solution. His education would be a guarantee of good government. The question of religion we do not touch.

The reasons alleged against the selection of Prince Alfred appear to be amongst those phantoms which the Foreign Office every now and then conjures up to entrap credulity on credit.

Though he be an English prince, he will remain in that condition only for a period. Fate has destined him to a small German sovereignty, a station whence no English minister could prevent his accepting the crown of Greece. It may be that France and Russia will not accede to the choice of Prince Alfred. It would be ridiculous for us to object to the arrangement by the exclusion of an individual prince who may any moment be removed from our control.

In the selection of Prince Alfred seems to be the best chance of preventing great European calamities. It is now acknowledged on all hands that our retention of the Ionian Islands can be justified on the sole plea that the cession of them by us would entail their occupation by Russia or France. If the Greek kingdom was strong enough to support and protect them this plea would fall to the ground. To a Greek king of English blood we might with dignity yield our infirm domination over a restive people. Turkey, it is said, would not hesitate to make over to the scion of so sincere an ally her interests in the provinces of Thessaly and Albania. If the election of Prince Alfred be nullified, the next choice of Greece will infallibly fall on the Duke of Leuchtenberg. He equally would require the same concessions of rights and augmentation of territory. But neither England nor Turkey would be thus disposed to consolidate Russian influence and thus open the field for invasion. That the Greek kingdom will be enlarged seems beyond a doubt. Under an English Prince the extension of territory could be effected peacefully and without peril. Under a Russian it would be the result of war and the nucleus of danger for ages.

Mr. Cobden on Blockade.



WHAT are we to say to Mr. Cobden's proposal to reform the maritime law of nations by abolishing the system of commercial blockade, and declaring private property exempt from capture at sea? The question somewhat resembles that which many of us have had to answer in our time, What shall we say to our friend Visto's proposal to improve our park by cutting down that fine old elm which our grandfather held to be its greatest ornament, and to which we ourselves have been in the habit of looking with so much reverence ever since we were able to crawl? Our first sensations upon such an occasion are usually compounded of indignation and amusement at the absurdity of the idea. By-and-bye, as Visto points out the mischief which the tree is really doing to the thriving young timber in its neighbourhood, shows how the scenery has undergone a change since the days of our grandsire, how we ourselves have cut away the accessory clump which gave the tree

its value, how the tree itself has in consequence become less necessary and more objectionable than it was half a century ago, and calls our attention to the fact that if it is not removed soon it will ere long remove itself by falling upon somebody's head, we begin to feel a little uneasiness; and, without altogether assenting to our friend's reasoning, or addressing ourselves to follow his advice, we suspend our judgment, resolve to look at the tree from other points of view, and congratulate ourselves upon the circumstance that at all events nothing can be done just now, and that it must stand till the proper season for cutting it arrives.

Derision enough has been showered upon Mr. Cobden for his proposal to destroy what so many of us have been taught to consider England's chief weapon of maritime warfare; and it is not surprising that such should have been the case. In some respects Mr. Cobden is an excellent advocate of any cause which he takes up. He is sincere, earnest, logical, and an effective speaker. His moral courage is unequalled; and he shrinks neither from opponents, nor, which is still more rare, from the consequences of his own arguments as they develop themselves. But in such a case as the present he labours under the serious disadvantage of being suspected. People look with some distrust upon an avowed member of the Peace Society preaching against a particular form of hostilities. No doubt he objects to blockades; but probably he objects to sieges and battles too. It is like a teetotaler arguing against the use of port wine. His arguments may sound well, but we fear he means to carry them further, and having warned us off port, to proceed to an attack upon sherry. Once for all, we think we had better take advice from some one of more unquestioned impartiality. Moreover, there is in this case a sort of chain of reasoning which makes us uncomfortable. The great principle for which we used to contend in days of yore was the right of closing upon an enemy's ports, and crippling or destroying his commerce, as a means of subduing him.

To do this effectually we claimed, and, in spite of the vigorous opposition of neutral nations, we exercised, the right of seizing his goods wherever we found them,—whether on board his own ships or on those of neutral powers. This was what Mr. Cobden, perhaps in his less enlightened days, called “crumpling up” an enemy; and there are many persons who still believe that it is a very effective process. But at the time of the Russian war we, first in practice, and afterwards by a formal agreement with the principal European powers, abandoned the right on which we had so long insisted of seizing an enemy's goods in neutral vessels, and thereby pulled out the keystone of the edifice which our ancestors had shed so much of their blood to cement. Thereupon our shipowners began to consider how this new state of things was likely to affect them in the event of a war between England and France, or America. They saw, or thought they saw, that the result of the change would be to throw all the trade of the world into the hands of neutrals; whose ships, even though carrying the property of a belligerent, are henceforth to be respected, while the ships of belligerents will be

exposed to the risk of capture. They argued, therefore, that, if the arrangements of 1856 could not be reversed, and the old rule restored, the only way in which British merchant shipping could be preserved from ruin in time of war was by exempting all private property from capture, whether it were in neutral or in belligerent vessels. This was the substance of Mr. Horsfall's proposal last session; a proposal which did not profess to touch the question of blockade, but which was generally felt to involve it, and consequently to present more difficulties than even its advocates were prepared to deal with. And now in the recess comes Mr. Cobden; and, with his customary honesty and vigour of reasoning, admits that Mr. Horsfall's proposal cannot be adopted without entirely altering the law of blockade; but, nothing daunted at this, goes on to argue that the sooner the whole system of commercial blockade is swept away the better for mankind at large, and for England in particular. Very well; but where are we to stop? If the Declaration of Paris logically brings us to Mr. Horsfall, and Mr. Horsfall logically brings us to Mr. Cobden, what will Mr. Cobden bring us to? This is a question which it is perfectly natural, and quite right to ask. It would have been well if our statesmen in 1856 had asked it of themselves before they signed the Declaration of Paris; and it is abundantly clear that in a matter of so much importance, and which is of so complicated a character, too much caution and forethought cannot be exercised before a step is taken.

We will not attempt to enter upon a discussion which requires far more space than we can spare, and which can hardly lead to any practical conclusion at the present moment, when a war is actually raging, and one of the belligerents is making use of a commercial blockade as his most effective weapon.

We will content ourselves with recording a few of the points which appear to us to be at once the clearest and the most important in the controversy.

The Declaration of 1856 must, we think, be taken to be irrevocable. Whether it might have been avoided or not is another question; but after the leading nations of Europe have solemnly agreed to admit into the code of International Law an article modifying the severities of war in so important a manner, we may feel sure that they will not retrace their steps till the day comes in which the people of Tiverton are to see the river Exe flowing up from the sea to the town. The interests of neutral nations, and the current of public opinion, will combine to maintain the ground which law has gained against force. The same may probably be said of any future step which may hereafter be taken in the same direction. It is sometimes suggested that though nations may agree among themselves upon certain points of International Law when they are at peace, they will tear up the agreement when they go to war. This is not true as a general proposition. If it were, International Law would be of no use at all. Of course it will from time to time be infringed in various ways, but substantially and on the whole its rules will be observed; because, though belligerents may be tempted to break them, neutral nations will act as their guardians. This is how the case of the Trent came to be settled so easily.

Again, we may observe that Mr. Cobden's opponents have recourse to a dilemma, which is rather plausible than sound. They say: If a change in the law is against the interest of England, she ought not to consent to it; if it is in her interest, other nations will not consent to it. The first part of the proposition is undoubtedly true; but the second is not so obvious. England is at once the strongest and the most commercial of maritime nations. She is the most vulnerable, but she can strike the hardest blows. Her normal condition is not one of war, but of peace; and it is while she is at peace as a neutral nation that she most keenly feels the effect of blows at the commerce of the world, which injure her without being aimed at her, and which she cannot return. It may therefore well be for her interest upon the whole to put an end to a system of warfare from which she suffers severely and gains nothing; and yet it may not be against the interest of any individual nation to oppose a change which in the event of that nation's going to war with a third power might tend to keep England from throwing her sword into the scale. We hear a great deal of the blockade of the Confederate States. It is probably more efficient than any other blockade is ever likely to be; but if it should cause such distress in France, for instance, as to bring France into the contest, it may be questioned whether the Government of the United States will find that they have gained more than they will lose by their recourse to it.

The whole subject is full of difficulty, and deserves more consideration than it has yet received.

The University of Durham.

THERE are some works of restoration greater, as acts of munificence and faith, than even works of foundation from which they spring. The conception and execution of so noble a design as a third University for England in the nineteenth century, was, if possible, a grander effort of self-denial and love than that which gave Oxford her "Durham College," four hundred years ago. It takes more of the moral and spiritual strength of man to give back than simply to give. Richard de Bury did well when he endowed his Theological College at Oxford, little reckoning of the day when Henry VIII. would dissolve it, and make away with its goods. But William Van Mildert and his Dean and Chapter did better when, in a far more selfish and luxurious age, they restored that college as the "University of Durham," knowing well that they were *giving back* to education at Durham what Henry had taken away from education at Oxford, and made over to them to enrich themselves withal. We heartily pity the man whose soul fails him to appreciate the greatness of this effort of faith towards God, and loyalty and love to the English Church. Of the Chapter who so acquitted itself in princely love all have gone to their reward, save one. And his name is still, thank God, a tower of strength—Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter. May he be spared to vindicate the purpose of that munificence in which he had a share!

After thirty years' trial, the experiment of a third University for England has been found to fail. Of course, it is a primary question whether such a trial suffices for such a conclusion. Would the first thirty years' trial of Oxford or Cambridge have given any better promise? But we are willing to assume that the experiment has failed. Like all experiments which, by force of nature, cannot take full account of future changes among men, it was, perhaps, destined to fail. If that almost miraculous progress of rapid and easy intercommunication between all parts of England which has been made since 1832, and the extent to which the endowments, at the old traditionary seats of learning, are now open to all the world, had been foreseen—we may be quite sure that the intention of the Church of Durham, in restoring to their original purpose funds which had been diverted from it, would have taken another form. The Bishop and his Chapter would, doubtless, have preferred to reinforce sound religious learning within the old Universities; or, at least, they would have sought for their project affiliation with these ancient mothers of literature. They would, probably, have shrunk from establishing a separate and independent University. But, however this may be, if *failure* there be, it is but of recent growth, and the result of causes which, hidden to the founders, are patent enough now. "In its first years," says Archdeacon Churton, who was more than once Examiner in Theology, "as a Theological school it was no failure. Many good men have gone from it to serve the Church at home and abroad." And, therefore, while the early years of success amply justify the venture which was made, in a large-hearted spirit, to give the North of England a University of her own; the later years of disappointment must be attributed to causes, unforeseen thirty years ago, which have now made the old Universities accessible to all.

The question has arisen now, What is to be done with the University of Durham? And the solution of that question, with which the powers of the State furnish us, does not satisfy the justice of the case. It is impossible to dispose of the University of Durham—that is, to dispose of more than 108,196*l.* worth of English Church funds, without due regard to the Church of England. The Commissioners whom Parliament has appointed to deal with the case have so proposed to dispose of this property. Their proposal, therefore, is unjust.

We have no desire to travel beyond this record. We might express a great deal of warm feeling, none the less real and true for being warm. We might say, honestly, with unfeigned sorrow, how we miss the spirit of Van Mildert in the President of the Commission. And this we must in candour, say. If Bishop Baring could not sympathize with the great purpose of his distinguished predecessor, so as to enter upon the minutes of the report some token of his appreciation of its real value to the English Church, he might at least have refrained from insulting the man whom, as its first Warden, the founder of the University delighted to honour. We cannot, out of mere respect to the late Warden's memory, pass this by. Whatever Dr. Thorp was or was not, he was one of the founders of the place, and for thirty years its active

governor, called to that high office by the confidence of the eminent men who were allied with him in the work—of whom five were of equal dignity, and (we say it respectfully) higher reputation than Bishop Baring,—Bishop VAN MILDERT, Bishop JENKINSON, Bishop GRAY, Bishop SUMNER, and Bishop PHILLPOTTS. Now it was hardly pardonable in Bishop Baring to wish such a man as the Warden out of his way at all; but it was rude and undignified, even indirectly, to tell him so. Again, if Bishop Baring could not accept Dr. Thorp's suggestion that it would be well to assign a retiring pension to the *office* of Warden, he need not have made haste to conclude that Dr. Thorp *must* be asking a pension for himself: and least of all need he have proclaimed that, but for his certainty that such was the meaning intended to be conveyed, he would never have offered him a pension at all! All this was surely most unepiscopal conduct, to say the least, considering also that Dr. Thorp was his Archdeacon. If Dr. Thorp's services were long able, and meritorious, they deserved the pension. Bishop Baring so described them when he offered it. But how Dr. Thorp should deserve the pension, and yet, not only *not* deserve it, but have his memory (now that he is gone) stained by the Bishop's public announcement that he grasped it from "reluctant" hands, is beyond our comprehension.

We gladly pass to the main question. And that we may justify our view of the great injustice to the Church which the Ordinances of the Commissioners propose to inflict, we will sum up their contents. We find them thus described by a correspondent of the *Guardian*:—

"1. There are to be three schools—1. Arts or Classical Literature; 2. Theology; 3. Physical Science; and in these schools, the degrees, respectively, of B.A. and M.A.; of B.T. and M.T.; of B.S. and M.S. How the degrees of B.T. and M.T. are to be hindered from clashing with the old degree of B.D. already conferred on men of three times longer standing than B.T. does not appear. Nor is the relation generally of new degrees in T. to old degrees in D. defined. Is it to be no longer D.D. but D.T.?"

"2. There are to be two sets of students—matriculated and non-matriculated. Each matriculating student is to choose his school; and then his matriculation examination will be made to turn on the subjects of the school selected. The matriculated student must ordinarily reside in college; but a dispensation may be granted to reside elsewhere. The non-matriculated student is to pay his fees, and attend lectures by permission, but need not reside at all. He is not eligible to degrees unless he matriculates.

"3. No matriculated student is to be required to keep more than *four* terms, in order to the degree of Bachelor, in any one of the three schools. After an interval of three years, any Bachelor (his name being kept on the books) may proceed to the degree of Master in the school of his choice. The terms are to be lengthened in duration and shortened in number. Thus—to take the one school which requires the most elaborate work, and *time* for the work—a student in theology may, in four terms, or schoolboy 'halves,' *finish* his education in the most difficult of sciences, and come out a full-blown B.T. And, after *one year's* residence, any 'licentiate or graduate in *medicine*' may go in for theology, and come out B.T., if he passes the examination! So also any 'licentiate in theology' according to the old system (which never recognized that position as a degree) may, without any further residence or examination, lay claim to B.T., and, after three years, to M.T.

"4. There are to be two Canon-Professors—one of Divinity, the other of Greek. According to the original

constitution, there should be a third—of Hebrew. But now there is to be no need of him. There are also to be one Professor of Mathematics and three Professors in the school of Physical Science—viz. of Chemistry and Metallurgy, of Geology and Mineralogy, of Mining and Machinery. So, the proportion of importance between Physics and Theology in the University will be as *four* to *one*. The University is to be secularized through and through. All Professors, except the Canons, are to have 300*l.* a-year; and all the Tutors, who are to be multiplied according to demand, are to have 250*l.* a-year. The Canon-Professors are to have nothing but their canonries. The other Professors and Tutors are to have shares of the fees, according to Mr. Lowe's favourite testing law of results—*i.e.* 'in proportion to the number of lectures delivered by them, respectively, and the number of students who have attended such lectures.' There are also to be teachers of modern languages, and book-keeping (!), and drawing, and surveying, and other subjects. The encouragement, therefore, to distinguished scholars and divines and men of science is to be small; to fifth-rate schoolmasters and commercial ushers and foreign refugees it will be great.

"5. The existing College and Halls are to be merged into the 'College,' which will, in fact, become a large 'boarding establishment for young gentlemen,' in which 5*l.* a term, rent, is to be paid for rooms *furnished*; and 25*l.* a week for board—'everything except washing included.' The expense of degrees will be 2*l.* for Bachelor, and 4*l.* for Master; or, if degrees in more than one school are taken, the cost will be 1*l.* for the first degree, and 2*l.* for the second. Ten-shillings a term, or a composition of 5*l.*, will keep a name on the boards. With such facilities, Durham will be able to advertise degrees for the million.

"6. The endowments of the University are to be made available for general purposes under a 'general account,' into which all the existing Fellowships and Scholarships are to be thrown. The only rewards of merit are to be eighty Scholarships—forty of 30*l.* a-year, and forty of 50*l.* The 30*l.* are to be open to all the world, except to members of the University of more than one month's standing, and will be tenable for two years. The 50*l.* are to be open to students in their second year, and will be tenable for one year only, unless the Scholar should intend to go in for a degree in another school, and then it may be held for a second year. No Scholar is to hold more than *one* Scholarship, and the Scholarships are to be divided *between* the three schools, according to 'results,' *i.e.* 'in proportion to the number of students respectively.' There will be another 'account' opened—the 'private Scholarship account,' into which the private foundations of Pemberton, Lindsay, Gisborne, Thorp, Newby, Van Mildert, Barry, Jenkyns, Maltby, and Ellerton will be all thrown, and reappear in a reduced and almost worthless form of from 25*l.* to 10*l.*, tenable for two years.

"7. All marks of identity with the ancient Universities and with its former self are to be obliterated. The very name as well as reward of a Fellowship is to be blotted out. There is to be 'no further election to the offices of Registrar, or Senior or Junior Proctor, or Pro-Proctor, or Censor, or Master, or Vice-Master of University College; or Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall; or Principal of Bishop Cosin's Hall; or Sub-Warden, or Sub-Treasurer, or Bursar, or Warden's Secretary, nor to any of the six Readerships, nor to any of the four Medical Scholarships, nor to any of the twenty-four Fellowships of the University.'

"8. All sects and denominations of belief are to be free of admission. None dissenting from the English Church are to be required to worship God. No oath, not even any subscription whatever, is to be required of any student, or member, or officer of the University. And, in the school of Theology, no test of any kind is to be applied to candidates for degrees, except a simple declaration, which any Dissenter may make *politically*, that he is '*bonâ fide* a member of the Church of England.'

There is nothing analogous to this scheme in the whole history of the English Universities. It is

such a revolution in academical life as cannot be compared with anything of which we have experience. The intellectual standard is lowered, the social standard is lowered, the religious standard is debased. It is the reduction of a University education to the depths of a measure in which cheapness and shortness are the ruling elements. Men in the lowest ranks of life may be blessed by a University education, because they may be raised by it intellectually, socially, and spiritually. But if they are kept down by it to the dead level in which they may have been born, and have neither time nor opportunity for advancing in all that is sound in scholarship, refined in manners, and true in religion, it is hard to say whether a University education is not more of a curse than a blessing. A University degree, in England at least, has hitherto been a passport to a man, because it has witnessed to his share in certain intellectual and social and spiritual privileges which have allied him with some of the noblest and greatest traditions of the English Church and nation. And the process by which such privileges have been made accessible to the lowest-born has been one of elevation practised upon the man, not of depression practised upon the University. When you have overturned all those well-tried academical laws which have hitherto governed the inner life of our Universities, and made them great, there may be nothing for you to do but to debase the system to the level of the new-fashioned model—cheap and easy. But then the honour of your degree has vanished. It has all but become a disgrace.

Now, apart from the patent injustice of alienating funds from their proper object at Durham, for such a purpose as this, there is the wanton injury inflicted upon the *original* Durham degree by this device for vilifying it; and, worse still, there is the outrage done to Theology, the greatest of all sciences, by placing it in a parallel line with "Mining and Machinery," and creating an unnatural path of cheapness and facility whereby to reach a theological degree. Is it possible that the Bishop of Durham can seriously contemplate a race of "Bachelors in Theology," teaching from the pulpits of the English Church, with no other guarantee of their fitness for such a dignity, through learning, or good faith, or orthodoxy, than this—that they have kept four "halves" at Durham, and paid twenty-five shillings a week for their board; simply declaring, before they are admitted to the degree, that they are *bonâ fide* members of the Church of England? Sir Morton Peto and Mr. Miall are, in their own sense, *bonâ fide* members of the Church of England.

We must deliver our protest against Bishop Baring's new University scheme in very distinct terms. We will defend the principle which he assails with no faithless or faint heart. The Church has an inalienable right to enjoy the property wherewith God has endowed her, for her own use alone. The property wherewith the University of Durham is endowed belongs to the Church. Therefore, the Church has the right alone to enjoy the use of the University of Durham. This is only the statement of a principle. There are many ways of working it out which diminish its apparent harshness. One, out of many such ways, would

admit Dissenters freely to profit by the bounty of the Church. But the control over her own means must remain with the Church, and the use of them is at her own discretion. The Durham University is just one of those institutions which the Church in the day of her wealth endowed, and in the day of her power protected, and in the day of her honour delighted to honour. Now, in the day of her need, it is an institution of the assistance of which she must not be deprived.

If a high road, cheap and easy, to degrees in "Mining and Metallurgy," with a standard of theology, by the way, watered down to suit the liberal atmosphere of dissenting patronizers, had been desired by Bishop Van Mildert and his Dean and Chapter, there were not wanting signs then, any more than now, of the popularity which they might have earned for themselves by setting it up. Or they might have adopted any other mode of bestowing their wealth, such as men in these days are so apt to adopt. But, instead of this, after much thought and prayer, they deliberately chose to erect a seat of learning, after the type of the old Universities, but with the aim and purpose of theological study more definitely marked than even in them. By what, therefore, short of arbitrary spoliation, may this their choice be disturbed? If the Church is to be allowed no security in the enjoyment of such a choice, made through personal loss before God, by some of her most learned and holy servants, who shall foresee the form and extent of the plunder which she has yet to endure? And how is future munificence, in the long dark time coming, when the needs of men and the public funds will be mutually incommensurate, to be encouraged? We are not of those who either fear or despair of the cause of the Church of England. But when we hear the counsels of Church spoliation proceeding from a board-room in which a successor of Butler and Van Mildert sits as Chairman, we are bound to call upon Churchmen not to fail in the part committed to them—to assert the Church's right to employ all her own gifts in her own cause,—in deepening the foundations of her spiritual strength, while she is watching for the souls of men.

Mr. Gladstone's Theory of Moral Guilt.



WHEN a great statesman devotes a period of leisure to a series of political harangues, it is but natural that the statements which he thinks becoming to make should receive very careful attention. Mr. Gladstone has recently pointed out, and with considerable force, that the formation of an opinion and its promulgation are processes of the mind in themselves distinct, and capable of being widely separated in order of time. Indeed, he added, with truth, that these phenomena might exist independently of any attempt to give them effect. Mr. Gladstone, therefore, in promulgating an opinion, must be held, not only to have deliberately adopted the opinion, but to have deliberately chosen the occasion for its promulgation; and it may be assumed that any proposition main-

tained by him has reached the middle drama of a great Trilogy. We do not propose to discuss the opinions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the American war, or the fitness of the opportunity selected for making the declaration which frightened Manchester, and paralysed the cotton-market; but it may be worth while to examine one of the opinions, deliberately adopted, and deliberately promulgated by Mr. Gladstone during his visit to Newcastle.

Great weight attaches to the sayings of eminent men. A stump-orator may declaim against the Church establishment without effective results, and a parish churchwarden, or even the beadle of a vestry may jeer at the rites and ceremonies of the Church without achieving serious consequences; but a University representative cannot minimise the distinction between Truth and error, or hold up to obloquy conscientious men, without incurring heavy responsibility. Mr. Gladstone is held to represent the opinions of sober and learned men, and, as a statesman, cannot be ignorant of the weight which belongs to general propositions advanced by him. In one of the Newcastle speeches the Chancellor of the Exchequer is reported to have maintained that "a great proprietor, who owned half a county, and refused to allow a meeting-house, where men might worship according to their consciences, to be erected on his estate, would use the rights of property in a way that involved moral guilt."

Now, 1st., we can hardly suppose Mr. Gladstone to be yet prepared to deny that the Churchman who refuses may have a conscience as well as the Dissenter who demands; though his language would certainly appear to be incapable of any other interpretation. It is, moreover, undoubtedly true that in many of those assemblies of men which he delights with his eloquence, it is taken for granted that all the conscience is on one side. Hence e.g., the term "Conscience Clause." And, 2nd., according to the Church of England, the assembling of men and women for religious purposes is not the true worship of CHRIST, unless it be done in His name, that is, by His authority, and according to His order, for the promotion of His glory. His authority we are bound to recognize, Who hath mercifully ordered a due succession of lawful ministers in His Church, and His truth we are bound as Christians to maintain; yet the representative of the University of Oxford proclaims that the hindrance of irregular and profane assemblies involves "moral guilt."

To pass by the grosser forms of Dissent, such as Mormonism, or Antinomianism, few men who value the primitive teaching of the Church of England will deny the perilous danger to immortal souls which results from the mischievous tenets of Baptists, Socinians, and Quakers. Belief in the Divinity of our Lord surely has, according to the Faith of the Church, some effect in bringing Christians to know, obey, and follow Him, who is their Lord and their God, in the way that leadeth to everlasting life. The Sacraments are not of such small account that it is a matter of no consequence whether they are or are not imparted to mankind; and yet one honoured with the confidence of many of the clergy announces to his companions, at a political dinner, that a rich man who, from conscientious mo-

tives, and within the limits allowed by law, uses his wealth in such a way as to decline to be accomplice in misleading his neighbours and distorting God's Revelation is chargeable with "moral guilt." No duty is more incumbent upon Christians than the promotion of Truth. Hindrance of error is a link in the promotion of Truth. If the blind are not to lead the blind, still less should those who enjoy the blessings of sight entrust to the blind the functions of guiding aright the stammering steps of the helpless and ignorant. To help the spread of desolating error is to lay waste and spoil the garden of Truth. How, then, shall one who uses his talents to hinder the spread of opinions which mar the eternal Truth of God be justly chargeable with moral guilt? God's Truth is not a matter of opinion. It is not that which a man troweth or thinketh; but rather that which "troweth a man," i.e. makes him true; just as mirth is that which makes a man merry. Teaching which does not make a man true is not a blessing but a curse; and, therefore, to help Socinians to deny the Divinity of our Lord, and afford them the opportunity of making new disciples, is not only no Christian duty, but an act of uncharitableness towards the real interests of our neighbour. What special circumstances may have induced Mr. Gladstone to announce this theory of the duty of great landowners to promote heresy and schism we do not know: still less can we conjecture the exact amount of property which, according to this theory, carries with it the obligation: for it should be observed that a landowner of smaller possessions than half a county who so acts is exempted from blame. It is, however, to be hoped that much time may elapse before the Chancellor of the Exchequer proceeds to the last drama of the Trilogy by endeavouring to give effect to his new and strange opinions. It is not too much to expect that the University of Oxford may lay to heart this authoritative announcement. Recent experience, at home and abroad, has abundantly shown that latitudinarianism in politics is nearly allied to latitudinarianism in religion. It is not surprising that a minister who promoted the spoliation of the Canadian Church should acquiesce in the admission of Dissenters into the University of Oxford. A supporter of the Burial Bill in its early stages, before the attention of the clergy was called to the probable effect of its provisions, would naturally be found in the ranks of those who would sweep away the temporal safeguards which fence in the indelibility of Holy Orders; and these antecedents would not be incompatible with a subsequent denial of the importance of the teaching of the Church, and the necessity of the dogma of Christianity. It is the eloquent author of *The State in its Relations to the Church* who says that they who begin by "denying the relevancy of religious differences to the competency of men for civil office, slide out of an allowance of division in things indifferent to one embracing fundamentals also." The writer must have foreseen the danger which would follow from sharing the counsels of the late Sir William Molesworth, and the present Mr. Milner Gibson, and other supporters of the Liberation Society. The necessity which Mr. Gladstone has imposed on himself of political co-

operation with the enemies of the Church will probably bring him into greater straits than those into which he has yet drifted; and it is not improbable that he may hereafter afford a yet more striking illustration of the truth of his own saying, that they who "neglect Truth proceed onward to insult it by placing on the same level with it every form of error."

Earl Russell and Prince Gortschakoff.

IT may be a necessary accident of the published records of English diplomacy that they should contrast unfavourably with those of the diplomacy of other Powers: but the defect need not be aggravated by *un-necessary* displays of ignorance and pedantry. Neither is it part of the art of despatch-writing to expose yourself and your country to cutting retort and sarcasm: nor again to slap friendly Powers in the face for nothing as you go by.

Anybody who has read the despatches of Earl Russell and Prince Gortschakoff reprinted in the *Times* of Nov. 1, from the *Gazette de Peterburgh*, will know what we mean; and will have observed the ingenuity with which Earl Russell has included the above three processes in one brief despatch.

Earl Russell is fond of alliteration. So, when he wants an illustration, he strings together Prussia and Portugal, Sweden and Saxony. Perhaps it was that "the last Whig" could not resist the temptation of telling Prussia that, unless it become Whig, it has no chance of maintaining its position as one of the Great Powers. It may be so, but it is hardly a dignified way of conveying the warning.

Then again, as if it were not enough to cram down English throats at every opportunity, reasonable and unreasonable, the clap-traps of Whiggery, Earl Russell must be mixing up a dose of the same stuff for the Russian. But here, unfortunately, he is convicted of a want of acquaintance with the facts and symptoms of the disease which he undertakes to cure.

Lastly, by what fatality, or by what rule, except the *prius dementat*, does a Whig minister of 1862, who has devoted himself to the fomenting, by "moral influence," every species of resistance to lawful authority in the old monarchies of Europe, expose himself and his Sovereign to the bitter sarcasm which lies in the concluding sentence of Prince Gortschakoff's despatch?

Russia may be all wrong, and England may be all right, about interfering between the Porte and the Montenegrins; but, if so, it is a pity that we should have a Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs who sets us up to be knocked about like ninepins by a clever Russian who does know facts, is not a pedant, and can write.

The policy of non-interference, announced as above by the Foreign Secretary for the East of Europe, has been once more placed in startling contrast with the policy of interference, or rather dictation, as announced by the same authority for the North of Europe in his despatch dated Sept. 24.

It is the old story. England, by her Whig-Radical Government and Tory Prime Minister, interferes and bullies where she dare; and makes a virtue of not interfering where she does not dare.

Wanton acts of folly provoke sharp answers. See the despatch of the Danish Minister of Foreign Affairs, dated Oct. 15, and published in the *Times* of the 22nd inst.

The Latest Discovery.

DROWNING men catch at straws. At a meeting of Church Societies, held at Norwich, Oct. 16, a layman, J. Allen, Esq., moved the following resolution:—

"That this meeting deeply regrets the course taken by the National Society with regard to the exclusion from union of those schools which require by their trust-deed that every child shall be instructed in the Catechism, Articles, and Liturgy of the Church of England, believing such a course will inflict a grievous injury to the cause of religious education, and is calculated to undermine the very principles on which the Society is founded."

Nothing could be more truly, or more mildly stated. But the bishop, being in the chair, made a discovery, and objected that he felt a difficulty about the resolution, inasmuch as he was not aware that any resolution to the effect complained of in Mr. Allen's resolution had at any time been passed by the National Society.

This was the straw; and for the time it saved the drowning man.

It is a remarkable thing that his lordship, who is *ex officio* a member of the Committee of the National Society, does not know that no meaning is or can be attached to the words "the course taken by the National Society," than that of the course taken by the Committee of the National Society; and it is even more remarkable that no one of all those present at the meeting should have been able to throw any light upon the subject. We beg, therefore, to inform the bishop, and his diocese, that the government of the Society is by charter vested in the Committee; and that, though there have been examples, some fifteen years ago, of the expression of the judgment of the general body of subscribing members being brought to bear, with more or less success, upon the Committee at the annual meetings, still the fact remains that "the course of the National Society" is the course of the Committee of the National Society, *and is nothing else*. The constitution of the National Society is, therefore, not a popular constitution. It does not even reach the French idea of constitutional perfection, viz. that of an election of a despot by universal suffrage. The great majority of the Committee are *ex officio* members, and the general assumption is that the Committee, as a whole, can do no wrong. The Committee, it is to be observed, have always insisted upon their extreme rights. In their view, a subscribing member is good only for paying money, and for implicit obedience. The annual meeting is good only for receiving, not for discussing, or presuming to question, the report then and there

presented to them through the Secretary. What wonder, under these circumstances, that nobody cares about the annual meeting!

The position is an unsound one, and the National Society is, in consequence, verging towards decay. Nevertheless, its status has a great adscititious importance; because the Committee of Council on "Education" assumes that the Committee of the Society represents the mind of the Society, and, therein, of the Church. In pursuance of this convenient policy the Committee of Council on "Education" were not slow to turn to their own uses "the course of the Society," that is, of the Committee, so soon as that course was inaugurated by the Committee in their Memorandum of July 23, 1860. All these are public facts, and well known; though the Bishop of Norwich and his archdeacons, and other clergy and laity of his diocese, do not seem to be aware of them.

The course of the Committee of the Society—that is, of the Society—has been precisely the course complained of in Mr. Allen's resolution. They have taken that course deliberately; have repeated it after many remonstrances; and, up to this time, have persisted in it. It is wholly indefensible upon any principle, Church or not Church; as we cannot doubt the Bishop of Norwich and his diocese will say when they know exactly what it is; which at present they do not. Some facts travel slow; which is, we suppose, to be accounted for by their astounding and almost incredible character. Nevertheless, two years and three months does seem a long time for a fact to take in travelling from London to Norwich.

Constitutionalism in Prussia.

WHAT the Orientals call the "black fate" seems at present to be weighing heavily upon the fortunes of Prussia. With a genuine desire on both sides to do their duty, the Government and the Deputies have only become inextricably involved in a collision; and Prussia and Germany at large suffers from this deplorable conflict. The general, we might say universal, opinion in this country appears to be that the King of Prussia and his Ministers are wholly in the wrong, and the Chamber of Deputies is as unequivocally in the right. We demur to that opinion. And we think it important that the true position of parties in this Prussian deadlock should be clearly apprehended by the English public. It is certainly trying to one's patience, in the present delicate conjuncture of affairs in Europe, to see the Prussians forfeiting their political reputation (of which they had little to spare), not only by putting back the good prospect that was opening upon Germany, but also by laying the basis of gravest dissensions which may end by imperilling the integrity of the Fatherland. And yet, if we restrain our impatience and examine the question, it will be found that our censure cannot be restricted to one party—that the ill-omened and most unreasonable conflict between the Deputies and the Herenhaus, and the Government, who are supported by the latter, is really due to a want of

statesmanship among the Prussians,—and that Germany might well echo the dying exclamation of Mercutio—"a plague on both your houses."

The position is this. Prussia, in common with all Germany, and like our own country, lately awoke to a sense of its insecurity from foreign attack, and desired the national defences to be put into better order. The grand reviews and the result of military investigation proved that the old system of merely three years' service was not sufficient to produce an army able to cope with the veteran battalions of other countries. Under such a system, of course,—owing to the constant changes in the *personnel* of the army—the average training of the soldiers, at any given time, would be only eighteen months; and although this average is considerably heightened by the fact that many soldiers do not withdraw when their period of service expires, still it was justly felt by the Government that the term of service was too short to perfect the soldier in the use of those arms of precision, and the new manœuvres thereby rendered necessary, by which the fortunes of every battle are now determined. Hence the Government, acting on the report of a committee appointed to investigate the matter, desire to lengthen the minimum period of service from three years to five; a regulation which, the conscription being kept up at its former amount, will also augment the numerical strength of the army. There was yet another reason why the Prussian Government should desire this augmentation and increased efficiency of the army: namely, that the Liberal party in the Chambers were always urging the Government to adopt a "strong policy," and to take measures to promote the unification of Germany, under the hegemony of Prussia—in 1860 they actually carried a motion to that effect *against* the Government—and the Government rightly argued, that, if the Chambers were to have their way, there must be an increase of the army, as it is ridiculous for a State to attempt a "strong policy" without having a strong army to back it. The Prussian Government, thus urged to ambition by the Liberal party, could not forget the snubbing it got twelve years ago from Austria under Prince Schwartzemberg, when it first thought of trying the game of ambition which a majority of the Deputies was again eager to force upon it.

These were the reasons which induced the Prussian Government to make that increase of the military-budget which has given rise to the present collision. It is beyond our knowledge to decide whether this increased outlay is altogether warranted, either as regards its amount or the mode in which it is applied. But we need have no hesitation in saying this much:—(1), that, amidst the universal increase of armaments that has taken place of late years, it was impossible for Prussia to remain stationary, with her old cumbrous and inadequate military system; and, (2), that the Liberals were especially prevented from objecting to an increase of the army, seeing that they urged upon the Government a policy which could only be carried out, or even attempted, by an army much larger and more efficient than that which existed. Mr. Disraeli never spoke a truer word than when, with happy sententiousness, he said that "military expenditure depends upon policy;" and in urging upon

the Government to adopt an ambitious policy, and at the same time objecting to an increase of the army, the Prussian Deputies were playing the unreasonable part of men who desire at once "to eat their loaf and have their loaf."

So far, then, as regards the merits of the question at issue between the Prussian Deputies and the Government, we think the Deputies quite in the wrong. Nor can the question, as a constitutional matter, be unhesitatingly decided in their favour. They, the Lower Chamber, have struck out a sum from the budget, which they were entitled to do; and the Upper House have rejected the budget as thus altered, which they also had quite a right to do. The Lower House thereupon "struck work," and refused to vote any other budget. What was the Government to do? It had introduced a budget, which the Lower Chamber had accepted with an alteration, but which the Upper Chamber rejected because of the alteration. There is a deadlock. No constitutionalist will say that the Prussian Deputies had a right to summarily override the decision of the two other branches of the Constitution. Granted that in the long run it is the Deputies, the Lower Chamber, which ought to decide in matters of finance: this has become a matter of usage, and with very good reason, in this country: but it is not a constitutional right which the Commons are entitled to put in force the moment the Upper House does not simply register their decrees. The paper-dues recently furnished an analogous conflict of jurisdiction in this country; but our House of Commons—though rooted for centuries in the estimation of the people, whereas the Prussian Chamber is but of yesterday—totally rejected the idea of arrogating a summary supremacy. And when we remove the question from an English to a Prussian ground, the case of the Deputies becomes weaker. *De jure*, King, Lords, and Commons, are equal and co-ordinate powers: and although usage has in practice greatly altered the original equality of these three branches of the Constitution in this country, in Prussia no such usage has been established, and the Constitution which the King swore to uphold is unquestionably more monarchical in spirit than ours. Manifestly it was so understood by him at Königsberg (under his predecessor it had been little more than a *nominis umbra*); and this fact ought to have had some weight with the Deputies, and made them more moderate in the assertion of a privilege which is ignored by the Constitution, and which they are claiming and establishing for the first time.

Let us now look at the reverse of the medal. We have commenced by setting forth the weak points of the position taken up by the Chamber of Deputies; because, obvious as some of those weak points are, and highly compromising as they are in the aggregate, they have been totally passed over by the newspapers of this country. We have got so much into the habit of considering that the Commons must always be in the right in constitutional questions, that we extend this inference (which is not perfectly correct even in our own country) with a hasty and still more erring dogmatism to the politics of other countries. But while thus directing attention to the questionable policy of the Prussian

Chamber of Deputies, we cannot hesitate to take equal exception to the course pursued by the Prussian Government. If the Government be technically right in asserting for the Executive and Upper House a co-ordinate legislative power with the Deputies, it ought not to ignore the course which Constitutional Government has taken in England, and which it manifestly is already taking in Prussia. The voting of taxes is a department of Government which chiefly, though not quite exclusively, belongs to the popular branch of the legislature, and which cannot possibly be carried in an entire opposition to it. As the matter now stands, the Prussian Government, having failed to get any budget voted for this year, has to adopt the arbitrary course of falling back upon the budget of the previous year, and levying the taxes which were then voted, but which are now objected to by the popular Chamber. We shall not say whether, under any circumstances, however exceptional, such a course is admissible; but we are very sure that it is an unwise course as matters stand. For, even granting that the increased expenditure for military purposes is called for by the state of the army and the aspect of European politics, of what use is an augmentation of the military power of the State if it be obtained at the expense of internal dissensions which must weaken Prussia far more than any increase of the army will strengthen her? A conflict between the Executive and the Representatives of the people will paralyse the power of the Government, and totally destroy that prestige upon which Prussia has hitherto reckoned as her most powerful agency for acquiring the leadership of Germany.

In many respects this most regrettable collision between the Executive and the Commons in Prussia suggests recollections of the still more lamentable conflict between King and Commons which gave rise to our Great Rebellion. The question then was about ship-money, as now in Prussia it is the budget for the army. In the circumstances of the case, Charles only asked what was reasonable for the support of our navy, the sheet-anchor of our national independence; and in our opinion the King of Prussia, in desiring to keep his army at the same point in numbers and efficiency as it has been for the last two years, acts wisely for the interests of his country. But what does that matter if the gain is to be obtained by incurring a still greater loss? The Deputies may be wrong in refusing the proposals of the Government, but their refusal introduces a new element into the question which the Government had at heart, and which every ruler of statesman-like ability would at once take into account. Their opposition may be deplored—it cannot be ignored. And now that it has been unmistakably manifested, now that the work of Government has come to a deadlock, and that domestic dissension is on the eve of assuming most painful and paralysing proportions, we think the Prussian Government would act wisely if it rather yielded to the reduction of the numbers and efficiency of the army than provoked a domestic conflict which would not only weaken but go a long way to destroy the power of the country.

The next step on the part of the Prussian Government will be to levy the taxes on its own

responsibility, in virtue of a budget which was voted last year by the legislature, but which this year has been rejected. No lover of Constitutional Government, and no one who wishes well to Prussia—as we sincerely do—can look forward to the consequences of such a step without grave disquietude and profound regret. Why does not the Prussian Government take a lesson from a Cabinet which but as yesterday adopted the principles of Constitutional Government, yet which has already outstripped in that career every other Continental Government. A perfectly similar collision on the budget has taken place between the Lower Chamber and the Government in Austria; and the result has been that, after due deliberations in the Council of Ministers, the Government formally declared, through Count Rechberg, its acceptance of the vote by which 60,000 florins was struck out of the budget. In this, as in many other instances, it is impossible not to recognize the superiority in statesmanship and breadth of views in the Austrian legislators compared with those of Prussia. And the Prussians must be blind indeed if they do not see that the mingled folly and dogmatism which, scorning all compromise, is now bringing Constitutional Government to a deadlock at Berlin, is rapidly destroying their prestige in Germany, and is making many an eye now turn to Vienna which formerly looked for a leader of the united Fatherland in the House of Hohenzollern.

The American Question. Recognition of the Confederate States.

HE question of the recognition of the Confederate States is one on which, though the main aspect remains the same as regards the ultimate result, the arguments connected with the details of time and mode are continually changing, as fresh circumstances occur in the progress of this wretched contest. Meantime it is not for the good of the public service that a Cabinet minister, strolling in the provinces, should use language which naturally deceives many people, and that another Cabinet minister should feel it necessary to put forth a strong counter-view. Possibly, however, the War Secretary was also delivering only his own sentiments—not only as regards the subject of recognition itself, but the arguments he uses. He tells his auditory that the rule in such cases is that interference is not to be expected or justified till one of the parties is exhausted, or the other incapable of continuing the contest! Now surely it is not the mere *power to continue* the contest which ought to decide the question, but the doing so *with any reasonable prospect of success*. We consider that the question turns mainly on this. For aught we know, the Federal States may be able to continue this sanguinary war for years; and yet the hope of conquest and re-union—as if the two things were compatible *in rerum naturâ*—may continue as distant as ever. But we maintain that as soon as the reasonable prospect of success ceases, other considerations, in which the rest of

the civilized world are deeply concerned, come into operation. We are not speaking of the actual suffering caused, for example, to a large portion of our own countrymen, (though we do not relinquish its value as an argument in its proper place,) but of those inflicted on the civilized world in general by the character which the war threatens to assume. The instant anything occurs to affect what is termed the “character of war,” from that moment other nations become interested parties, and are called upon to act, not only on their own account, but as trustees for posterity. The character of war, as regards the conventionalities which soften its severities and mitigate its horror, is, like all matters which rest on opinion and the general tone of feeling, of slow growth. Not so its decline, which is rapid. Anything, therefore, which tends to affect this becomes the concern of the civilized world. We are old enough to remember the Greek struggle against their Turkish oppressors, which issued in the establishment of the present kingdom of Greece. At that time many persons objected to the recognition on the general ground of “non-interference,” and in particular, on the ground that the Turkish Government had not shown that it was incapable of quelling the insurrection. But it was alleged, and justly, that the question no longer turned upon that point; but that the cruelties and savage ferocity which had now been displayed and were increasing in intensity, rendered it necessary that the war should be put down as a public nuisance, and as throwing us back in the course of civilization and humanity by familiarising the minds of nations with these savage barbarities. The American war is now drawing towards this point. Happily it has not yet reached it; but the recent attempt of the President to create a servile war, with all its attendant horrors, calls upon us to be prepared to meet it, and to step in to avert it, by timely recognition, whenever the fitting moment shall arrive. We must be prepared to act, not by ourselves, but in concert with other European Powers who are ready at any moment to act with us; and we must show, in the least offensive way that we can, that we are so prepared. Although viewing the question as regards the interests of the civilized world at large, yet we cannot lose sight of the fact that the lives and property of vast numbers of our countrymen are involved in this question; and that nothing can excuse us if, from any timidity or undue caution on our part, they should be exposed to the horrors of a servile insurrection. As a first step towards this, we ought at once to despatch some powerful vessels of war to New Orleans, to be ready to protect and afford an escape to our countrymen and countrywomen there. There would be no offensive display in this. We should be merely taking up the gauntlet which the President has thrown down, and taking necessary precautions against a danger of which he is the author. For any collision which might arise from this we should not be responsible. In European commotions we have uniformly had our ships of war present for the protection of our people, and have thereby also afforded the means of escape from butchery and ill-treatment to numbers of the worsted or weaker party, on whichever side they might be.

We have confined ourselves thus far to that view of the question which bears on the international interests of the civilized world. But we would not be supposed thereby to lose sight of or detract from the force of the other arguments affecting it. As we said at the outset, our remarks are concerned with the general question of recognition, and the principles which should guide us; rather than prescribing the time and mode of adopting it. Few will deny that it is good for the interests of civilized humanity that the overgrown unprincipled bully, the late United States, should be broken up and humbled. Mr. Stanton tells us that, prior to its dissolution, it would have "dictated to the world in arms." Mr. Stanton Americanizes. But it is better that the component parts of the monster should wear each other out by mutual attrition, rather than that the object should be accomplished at the cost of the blood and treasure of peaceable nations expended in resisting its aggression.

Nothing, we fear, will make the present generation of Americans see that the continuance of the old Union, as embracing a whole continent, was an impossibility, and must in due course have given place to other processes; and that the time must eventually come when the New World will present as many separate states, whether kingdoms or republics, as the old. For the remaining states of the old Union we anticipate much good. We believe that there is, in that vast community, much that is honourable and just, and containing the elements of a really great people, though hitherto it has been crushed beneath the hoof of an unprincipled democracy, and its voice stifled by the most oppressive tyranny the world ever witnessed. Dreadful as is the present state of things, yet it will eventually prove a blessing in dispelling the illusion which popular passion and fear had thrown around the late Republic, and in exhibiting to the world a large democracy in its full development, showing that whatever vices have belonged to, and have been imputed to the worst forms of monarchical government, have been produced in an exaggerated form in the full-blown democracy of the United States. Experience alone could have opened men's eyes to this fact, and experience has now done it.

One humiliating thought of necessity presents itself. The American secession has long past that point in the progress towards independence at which our Government recognized Belgium and other states. Possibly the time has not yet fully come for the recognition of the Confederate States. But the fact of our not doing so, after our conduct towards other and smaller states, will of necessity be set down, both by Americans and Europeans, to that abject fear of the Americans which seems to have actuated our Whig Government in our transactions with America. To this we must submit. We may not purchase the semblance of consistency by a premature recognition. But what we do contend for is, that, when the proper time does arrive, we may do what is right, irrespective of Yankee blustering and threats—and that, meanwhile, our Government should take immediate steps to protect our countrymen and countrywomen, whether at New Orleans or New York, from those outrages which, presum-

ing on our former cowardice, the modern Kirk who now reigns in military despotism at New Orleans seems to be daily heaping on those unfortunate English who are brought within the reach of his insolent and brutal violence.

Crown Patronage.



It is officially announced that the Rev. Henry Montagu Villiers has been presented by the Crown to the living of Adisham-cum-Staple, in the county of Kent, worth some 1300*l.* a-year. So long as the scandal involved in this exercise of the Patronage of the Crown was not confirmed, we were satisfied to believe that it had no foundation in fact. We could only conceive that some of the lively enemies of the Ministry were putting the story about for purposes of their own. But it seems that it is all true. The only enemies of the Ministry in the matter are the ministers themselves. The living is not only one of the best in the county of Kent, but one of the best in England. There is no question at all about its value; but there is a great deal about the propriety of the disposal of it. It is only just that extraordinary services should be met with extraordinary recognition; but what have been the services of this young man of twenty-five? We are not making any personal attack on Mr. Villiers. All we say is, that there ought to be the means of justifying this appointment, and we do not find that any such means exist.

The Bishop of Winchester the other day went to see his clergy in the Archdeaconry of Southwark, and he tried to do what a great many other bishops have tried to do before him very lately. He wanted to show how it is that there are fewer candidates for Holy Orders every year.

The Bishop of Winchester pointed to the sceptics who are covered with honours and are full of authority at our Universities, and we cannot say but that he pointed in a very likely direction. But men who turn their thoughts to these things often turn them away when they read of such an appointment as this of Mr. Villiers, and begin to think that there are other causes at work also to account for the difficulties of the Church.

The Bishop of Durham and the late Archdeacon of Durham.



AN ecclesiastical scandal of the month is the Bishop of Durham's attack on the late Archdeacon of Durham. The archdeacon was Warden of the University of Durham, with a salary of 500*l.* per annum. This the Commissioners proposed to save, on the next avoidance, by uniting the Wardenship with the Deanery. The archdeacon objected to this arrangement, as providing no guarantee for the academical qualifications of the future head. He submitted two counter proposals: 1. To retain the Wardenship as a substantive office with its present salary; 2. To provide a retiring

pension for the Warden, as was already done for some of the professors. The Bishop says now that the latter was a "suggestion" of his own desire for a pension: but he did not say so to the archdeacon himself; on the contrary, the letter which his lordship has published negatives both the archdeacon's propositions, and then adds that the Commissioners "all think it fair" to offer *him* a pension in order to bring the arrangement which he objected to into earlier operation. The archdeacon, in his old age and failing health, feeling neither able nor willing to prolong the controversy, signified his consent in deference to the wishes of the Commissioners. He died before the time fixed for his retirement, and now the Bishop, pretending to publish the correspondence (which he does not do), seizes the opportunity to remark, in a long letter to the *Guardian*, that the archdeacon was in possession of 4000*l.* a-year from Church funds, and would not have made the "suggestion" if his mind had not been impaired by age and infirmity. His lordship, who is thought to be an amiable, kind-hearted man, probably overlooked the pain which such remarks must give to many sorrowing survivors; but we marvel that even in the heat of a newspaper controversy he should have failed to see their effect on himself. The Bishop's mind, we presume, was not impaired by age or infirmity: he saw the impropriety of the "suggestion"—which the archdeacon, by the way, indignantly repudiated the moment it was mentioned to him—and the effect it would have on the character of his failing old archdeacon; yet he deliberately *offered* the pension to the dying man, and as soon as he was in his grave rushed into the newspapers to point the finger of scorn at him!

Sisterhoods.*



WE have for some time been desirous to say a few words on the very important subject to which our title will call the reader's attention; and the appearance of the authorized Report of the Summer Congress of Churchmen at Oxford will enable us to shape our remarks with a little more certainty as to the intent of the papers which were read, and the speeches which were made upon this subject. For, till this Report appeared, it would perhaps have been premature to have made comments on the proceedings as recorded in the newspapers, although some of these, especially those in the *Guardian*, seemed to be drawn up carefully and accurately. We have now, we suppose, such a Report as we may rely on, and such as the readers of papers and speakers will recognize as truly representing what was said.

The subject is one of such deep interest, that we hope to be pardoned if we profess at the outset our intention to eschew all light expressions, or any attempt at smart writing, and our resolution, as far as possible, to treat it in that calm practical tone which Englishmen and women wish to use and hear when they address themselves to any practical work, especially a work of charity and self-devotion.

The growing sense of our religious and social need of such help as only systematic and permanent female ministration can supply for effectually carrying on those works

* *Report of the Proceedings of the Church Congress of 1862*, held in the Sheldonian Theatre and Town Hall, Oxford, July 8th, 9th, and 10th. Oxford and London: J. H. and James Parker. Pp. xix and 288. See pp. 120—149.

Deaconesses. An Essay, by the Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D. Longman and Co. 1862.

of mercy which the Author of our salvation has both enjoined and made the test of our obedience here and hereafter,—the insuperable difficulties of parochial charges without such help,—the faulty regulations of hospitals, workhouses, almshouses, and orphan homes, penitentiaries, and prisons,—the want of visitors to relieve and reclaim and counsel the sick, the self-neglecting, and ignorant poor, especially in districts where some new mining or manufacturing enterprise has suddenly drawn together multitudes of hard-handed and strangely associated people,—all these causes point out the employment of women in works of piety and charity as a question of the deepest interest to the vitality of this Christian kingdom at the present moment. Those who live in quiet rural retirement, as yet removed from the immediate spectacle of the changes that are in progress, may not have felt the need as it has been felt by Dr. Howson at Liverpool, or those whose labours in other places are mentioned by him with due honour; but it has made itself heard far and wide, has met with a willing response from many good and tender hearts, and we cannot be so indifferent as not to desire heartily to speed it on, if it can be advanced by any encouraging words of ours.

Still it must be acknowledged, that, in this revival of an old recognized order of female ministers in the Church, we have yet to feel our way and proceed carefully, remembering well the caution that our good may not be evil spoken of. There was certainly no subject of discussion introduced at the Oxford Congress at which the discussion itself, according to the good-humoured admonition of Mr. Henry Hoare, was so near "coming to grief," as at the reading of the papers and delivery of the speeches on the subject of Deaconesses and Sisterhoods. Let us inquire why this was so, with all honour and respect to those gentlemen who were most prominent in the debate, of whose earnest benevolence there is no question.

There are some things confessedly in Christianity of which the spirit is inseparable from the form. There are many others of which the spirit can be preserved, while the forms are changed with changes of place and time. Rightly to distinguish these things is a great part of Christian discipline. And we are not the first to make the remark; for the same thing is said in substance by the sagacious old Father, Tertullian, where he is addressing himself to questions akin to this. But to confound these things together is a grave mistake, and one that has led to more inconveniences than it is pleasant to remember.

We shall not attempt to go deeply into the historical precedents furnished by the early Church. These inquiries are for learned scholars; and, after all, little can be added to what Bingham has collected, or what, in the most practical portion of the subject, has been well digested by Dr. Howson. But it is right to remark that little good can be done by the appeals made by some highly respectable members of the Congress to ancient writings of disputed and uncertain authority. We suppose it will be generally granted that, though undoubtedly there were ministering women, widows and maiden sisters, in the Church from apostolic times, it would not be easy to discover that Phœbe, or Lydia, Dorcas, or Priscilla, were bound by any other rule or bond than the bonds of the Gospel, any more than "the elect lady," the pious mother of pious children, to whom S. John addresses an epistle. It is the less necessary to argue the point, because S. Basil himself, whose writings furnish the earliest known and acknowledged specimen of rules for the discipline of maiden sisters, confesses that the earlier Fathers were more indulgent to cases of associated females who, on some motives more or less to be approved, changed their plan of life; but adds, that "as, by the favour of God, the Church was now grown stronger," it was time to lay down stricter canons. Far be it from us to say a word to derogate from the ever-revered memory of good S. Basil, but when he drew up his rules he could not foresee all the consequences; and, if we think it matter of regret that such rules were ever received into the Church under such severe and rigid sanctions, our quarrel is far less with S. Basil, or any other Greek or Latin Father, than with

those who, closing their eyes to the lessons of so many succeeding centuries of Church history, with fervent piety it may be, but with too little judgment, would revive something like them now.

It was scarcely possible but that the laws of the Church under the Eastern empire, or in the subsequent feudal times, should bear some traces of the times in which they were made. They suffered, in this respect, something of the same infirmity—we use the comparison not offensively—as Loyola laboured under when he drew up the rules for his famous company. He had seen, as a soldier, what could be done by the unquestioning military obedience of a soldier to his commanding officer, and he sought to transfer such obedience to more sacred things. The command of the superior was to be instead of any appeal to private conscience. Can it be truly said that there was nothing like this in the statutes of S. Basil or S. Benedict, excellent precepts and admonitions as they otherwise contain? Was it right to say that the inferior in a monastery should be, to the father abbot or prior, as a tool in the hand of the workman? Was it right to say that a maiden, repenting of her first resolve, and lapsing, so to speak, into honourable matrimony, should be regarded by the Church as an adulteress? What warrant could they find for this in S. Paul, in either case? Surely not in the texts which make the obedience of disciples a filial obedience to their spiritual father; nor in that chapter which one of the benevolent speakers at Oxford commends to the reading of his deaconesses who may be contemplating marriage. Let no word be said in dissent from the good Fathers in their praises of a single life devoted to works of piety and mercy, as the highest Christian life; but this life must be maintained by those who “stand steadfast in their own hearts, having no necessity, but having power over their own will.”

A very learned and charitable speaker at the Congress observed that “women are guided by instinctive feeling rather than controversial argument.” Most true; but how it should be a legitimate inference, that women should therefore be invited into a Sisterhood, which they are to be told they cannot afterwards forsake without forfeiting their vocation and the Divine blessing, it distresses us to imagine. Who were more devoted Sisters of Charity than Evelyn’s Margaret Blagge, or Ken’s Margaret Murray? They both became afterwards young wedded wives. Did Ken or Evelyn speak of them as of persons that had forfeited their vocation?

“Look at this picture, and at this.” If we teach our fervent-spirited maidens, as some have too inconsiderately done, that they may be well guided by some instinctive feeling which longs for some more absolute self-sacrifice, to what standard shall we invite them? To S. Teresa, or the ladies of the Port-Royal? There were no more devoted women, nor, in some respects, more prudent and refined spirits, than these in all Christendom since the revival of letters. But can we be such blind admirers of ascetic piety as to have no misgivings when we see the pictures, which their letters present, of inner conventual life? To speak only of this single point, of allowing no revocation of a hasty choice, what is the comfort which the gentle Agnes Arnauld has to give to a Sisterhood under the government of a worldly-minded superior, “who had never regarded her religious vow, but as a galley-slave regards his chain?” Only, in effect, this:—“You deserve your chastisement. But for your own criminal complaisance, you would never have elected such an abbess. The rule gives you the power of electing; your election made, you have nothing for it, but to obey.”* Alas! and what obedience was this but the obedience of galley-slaves? “But why make laws,” she asks, “which presuppose that there will be superiors more willing to destroy than to build up?” The answer is not very difficult. If during all the centuries of the Benedictine rule there had never been an instance of a father abbot or lady abbess who abused their trust, the law might have been silent till the need of a remedy had appeared: and

we might believe that all superiors in convents were like Horace’s Scythians, where no mother-in-law was ever known to play the step-mother.

Of course, where there is any voluntary association of men or women, there must be rules and laws to govern the members. And there must be a president, a warden, a superior, under whatever name the office goes, to whom the principal executive and directing powers must be committed. But we may surely say of this, what Hooker says of the regal or episcopal power, “Not the most limited, but the best limited, is best.” It must be limited; and provision should be made to restrain all excess, or negligence, or abuse of power. Absolute, unquestioning obedience is a dangerous thing, alike for those who claim and those who render it. The most devout and conscientious persons have felt how appalling a responsibility is the exercise of any act of uncontrolled power. And for the institution of any such office of permanence we have actually no Scriptural warrant whatsoever.

Parental, conjugal, regal, and pastoral authority, all these have the undoubted sanction of holy Scripture; and come to us with a *jus divinum*, which nothing can exempt us from owning: those on whom the authority devolves must exercise it; those who are subject to it must obey it. And from these spring other delegated and subordinate authorities, to which we are indispensably bound to submit ourselves in things not plainly repugnant to the Divine law. But all these, even the first, are limited: in some respects they form, necessarily, checks upon each other; and none of them allow of any lordship over the conscience, or interfere with that personal responsibility towards God, which is appointed to every reasoning creature. It is an idle complaint to say that such limitation would do away with all obedience, and make the discipline of a society impossible. The above instances of divinely-ordained, and divinely-sanctioned authority, yet divinely-restricted, prove the contrary. But if we institute an authority different from all of these, we must carefully guard against two dangers: first, that we do not interfere with duties to be rendered to divinely-ordained authority; nor, secondly, exceed the bounds which we find set to divinely-sanctioned authority. That is, we must not interfere with any rightful claim of parents, husbands, kings, or pastors; nor attempt to set up a power more absolute than that of magistrates, masters, or householders, or other legitimate eldership or office. These limitations allow of the most perfect discipline and good order; the most entire obedience as regards the work to be done: but they exclude all lordship over the conscience, and all undue restraint of personal freedom.

And it is of the essence of personal freedom that any associated member of a voluntary society should be at liberty to depart at will. If the motives influencing such departure are not the most perfect, still it is a far worse evil to attempt to retain an unwilling subject. But the motives may also be altogether praiseworthy. Suppose the case of a charitable Sister of Mercy, who has employed her labour and her wealth in succouring the friendless and poor who were strangers to her by blood, but by some reverse of fortune afterwards finds orphans of her own kindred claiming her superintendence and her alms. Can there be a question, in such a case, which of the two claims should be preferred?

If we exceed these limitations, we do so without any Scriptural warrant or sanction: and are we not in danger of infringing the Divine command, which seems to forbid expressly both the claiming and the rendering of any self-chosen, unlimited obedience? (*Matt. xxiii. 8—10.*) We know that some of the early rules insist much upon the vow, or act of consecration, once past; and one of the benevolent gentlemen at the Congress speaks of these vows approvingly, as nothing but “the outward recognition of a tie which had already knit the soul” in that kind of union with its Lord; and another “trusted it would be borne in mind that the deaconess was a woman called by God to a devoted life as her lifework.” Such language is at least unguarded, and may well have created a sensation

* *Lettres de Agnes Arnauld*, ii. 394. Paris, 1858.

in the assembly where it was heard. If these gentlemen, who seem to have looked more to the age of the Fathers, than to the lessons of later history and experience, would only take S. Augustine for their guide, they would find that great teacher opposing many just limitations to the validity of female vows. (*Quæst. in Num. iv. 59.*) Some early councils forbade all consecrations of ladies under forty. But nothing can be more piously wise on such a question than the words which the Bishop of Oxford is recorded to have used: "It seems to me to be of the essence of such a religious life, that it should be continued, not because in a moment of past fervour a vow was made, but because, by a continual life of love, that life is again and again freely offered to the service to which it was originally dedicated. I feel, therefore, that, instead of the perpetual vow representing the higher, it is the admission of the lower standard."

Let the discipline of a household of deaconesses be as perfectly maintained, in all that pertains to their work, as it possibly can be: let it be even military in its exactness, if such exactness is found really good for the work; but let there be no dominion attempted over the conscience, no obedience dictated by fear, no encouragement of hasty self-consecration to unknown trials, no interposing of human authority in matters of private duty towards God: as if the command of a superior could either dispense with, or render more binding, any divine command. And let there be no multiplying of vexatious injunctions, and petty and useless regulations; as if for the very purpose of turning the work of mercy into a yoke of servitude, and either galling and wearying those who wear it, or, still more fatally, if they are not galled by it, changing the willing and reasonable obedience of daughters into the dull and spiritless labour of machines.

And, besides this, we would repeat it again, there must be entire freedom, without censure or hindrance, to depart. Of what use can the toil of a galley-slave, to revert to Agnes Arnauld's phrase, be in fulfilling works of mercy? Surely, if the rule and order of a house of mercy be as well and wisely framed as they might be, there would be no need of more, nothing to prompt a wish for any moral compulsion to retain the sisters in it. A clergyman, undertaking a cure of souls, is not the more likely to wish to change, or feel unsettled, because he knows he may resign it if he will. And if the deaconesses are to be considered as a subordinate rank of the ministry, it is scarcely reasonable to exact from them more than is exacted from the clergy themselves, or any perpetual renunciation of such earthly ties as a clergyman is allowed to enter into, or not, at his own discretion.

Is it not possible to have all the advantage of well-ordered female ministry, as in apostolic times, without the questionable regulations of conventual life, which are already creating something like controversy among those good sisters who have tried them? Mortification of the body, and retirement and contemplation, are never safe if they end in themselves: they are but a part of the Christian life; and whenever we find them unaccompanied by charity, by active and diligent works of mercy, they fail most grievously in either purifying or elevating the character. There is doubtless, far more commonly, a danger of undervaluing them altogether as a means to this end: but we speak not to profane, but to religious people. If we would have them rightly valued, for this very cause let us endeavour to give them their right place, a place which they must have in every Christian who seeks to be perfect, however busy his path of life may be. But let us not call them "the religious life," as if they alone were sufficient, or as if their predominance over all other duties could make for us a nearer and shorter way from earth to heaven.

The Church in Africa.



HE modern Missions of the Church are well worthy the careful attention of the ecclesiastical historian. We do not mean that he who would write the history of the Christianity of the nineteenth century must be prepared to give a large portion of his pages to the efforts now being made in every quarter of the globe to extend the bounds of Christendom. This is of course true; the colonial dioceses are an integral part of the Church of England. In the vigour of their administration, in the rapidity with which they have multiplied, in the remarkable manner in which their episcopacy at once takes root, and becomes naturalised among peoples who are entirely outside the aristocratic traditions of Europe, they are the strongest proof of the undiminished vitality of the Church's system. If the Dean of Chichester is spared to write the biographies of the two last primates, he will find the thread of his narrative conduct him continually to lands beyond the sea. But, apart from this, we believe that in what is occurring in those countries before our eyes, he will obtain the best clue to the correct understanding and appreciation of much which he has to relate of those who fostered the infant Christianity of England. The proceedings of Augustine and his immediate successors will often have light thrown upon them from the episcopate of a Selwyn and a Grey.

For example, the colonial Churches are independent, to a great extent, of that modern legislation which is the rule of the Establishment at home. The English ecclesiastical law is not, we believe, binding on the colonies. Considerable doubt exists as to the validity of the powers purported to vest in the bishop by virtue of the letters patent. The relation of the Australian and African metropolitans to the see of Canterbury is by no means ascertained by modern enactments. The result of all this is, that the colonial bishops are being thrown more and more, by the very necessities of their condition, upon the powers inherent in their office, and upon the ancient and universal law of the Church Catholic. It is interesting in a mere antiquarian point of view, to see the canons of primitive councils, and the *dicta* of early prelates, drawn forth from the dust of centuries, and furnishing principles of action at once sound and to the point. The recurrence of the Church to a primitive position, disencumbered, in some measure, of the fetters of an establishment, and brought face to face with heathen populations, quickens into new life the code which was her guide when she occupied the same position amid the unconverted tribes of Germany and Gaul.

Again, any one taking up the histories of the sixth and seventh centuries will be struck with the perpetual intercourse maintained with Rome. A journey to Rome, in spite of the immense difficulties attending it, seems to have been regarded as essential by the more energetic metropolitans of Northern Europe. Roman controversialists are, of course, not slow in deducing an argument in favour of the Papal supremacy. We believe rather that the motive of these journeys to the seat of the Apostles, as it was called, was much the same as that which now brings periodically the most devoted of our colonial bishops to England—viz. the necessity of consulting the older and more thoroughly organized Episcopate upon questions of administration, the policy of strengthening themselves in their distant fields of labour by maintaining a close connection with the head-quarters of civilization; and last, not least, the obtaining funds, then as now, among the faithful of the older Christian world, for the extension of their operations in new districts. We repeat, then, our statement that many a knotty point of ecclesiastical biography, many a proceeding which the annalist vainly taxes his ingenuity to explain, will be often far more easily unravelled by the observation of what is passing in our own times, under similar circum-

stances, than by the efforts of antiquarian and philosophical research.

Of all the colonial Churches, that of South Africa is in many respects the most interesting. In the first place, it is impossible to watch the re-entry of Christianity into that vast continent, without calling to mind the hold which it formerly possessed in that quarter of the globe. Africa was a most important part of early Christendom. Some of the most vital points of doctrine and discipline were there fought out. Africa was the birth-place of the Latin version of the New Testament. It furnishes us with a powerful weapon for our controversy with Rome in its protest against trans-marine appeals. The Donatist schism has, again, a close bearing upon the same controversy; whilst in S. Augustine it presents us with a name which is a possession to all time. There is a remarkable expression of Tertullian, showing the extent to which African Christianity had spread in his day; "To persecute the Christians was to *'decimate Carthage.'*" That first African Church perished; and now, after the lapse of centuries, the foundations of a second have been laid. What the Roman province in the North of Africa was formerly, that the English settlements in the South appear now destined to become, with, as we trust, more lasting success, the base of the operations of the civilized world upon that most mysterious of continents, the door by which Christianity shall yet effect an entrance into those hitherto inaccessible regions of the interior, of which not even a fable has reached us.

A second special element in the interest attaching to the African Church is, that it gave the first example of the extension of the English episcopate beyond the Queen's dominions, by purely spiritual authority. The consecration of Bishop Mackenzie is likely to become the date of an epoch in modern Church history; we do not say this on account of the nobleness of his own self-sacrifice, but because the mission given him by the Church alone was the first outward expression in modern times of the authority inherent in the Church as a Divine institution, and cannot but exercise a vast influence in clearing up the notions of many about the respective provinces of the Church and State. It will thus, whilst facilitating the spread of Christianity abroad, have an important, although perhaps not an immediate, reaction upon ecclesiastical affairs at home.

The progress of the Church in South Africa is, we think, worthy of the field of labour. We are not writing the eulogy of an individual, and therefore do not dwell upon the indefatigable activity and singleness of purpose which have characterized the episcopate of the Bishop of Cape Town, but there are two features of his administration which we desire to notice, as being of general interest. It appears that the parochial system was not introduced into England until some seventy years after the arrival of Augustine. It was under the rule of Theodore, the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, that this country ceased to be occupied only by isolated mission stations, and to be broken up into defined ecclesiastical districts. Now that which was not accomplished *here* until six metropolitans had passed away, has been completed in Africa under the rule of the first. The diocese of Cape Town is, we believe, divided through its whole extent into parishes, whose boundaries are conterminous. Each parish possesses a church, a clergyman, a school; so that in whatever part of that great tract of country a stranger may settle, he at once finds himself under spiritual charge, having a recognized claim, as if he were still in England, upon the ministrations of a definite pastor. We regard this as an immense result of a single episcopate; whether it be regarded in a purely religious aspect, or as the transfer to a foreign soil of one of those national institutions which, by accustoming the poorest to the feeling of belonging to some place, and thereby possessing rights and privileges, and by affording scope for local administration, has done more than anything else to produce the distinctive English character. The parochial system has borne as valuable fruits to the *State* as to the *Church* of England. Its complete establishment, therefore, in the chief African diocese is an important event, both in the civil and ecclesiastical history of the colony.

The other point to which we would advert, as of equal interest to the civilian and the Churchman, is the establishment in the neighbourhood of Cape Town of a college for the education of the children of African chiefs. This institution is, we believe, partly the result of the sagacious policy of Sir George Grey. This plan commended itself to him as eminently calculated to promote general civilization, and thus indirectly to put a stop to those native wars which have so often desolated our border settlements, and cost the mother country such a large expenditure of blood and treasure. The institution has been founded about four years; the results, as far as they can be at present discerned, have been most satisfactory. The children have manifested an aptitude for the instruction given them. We observe that they are stated to have made great improvement in arithmetic, drawing, and music, as well as the more common subjects of education. The wild barbarian character has become gradually modified in the presence of civilized life. It cannot, of course, be predicted how far these acquired habits of thought and action will hold out against the counter influences which will surround them, when the youths return to their own people; but we can scarcely doubt but that, in the most unfavourable cases, a great residuum of good will abide. The founders of the Cape Town College must not flatter themselves that their pupils will all turn out good men; but they may, we think, confide in this, that they will none of them entirely lose the traces of the education they have received. And this modification in the character of their chiefs must necessarily, in the course of years, produce its effect upon the several tribes. If we might throw out a suggestion, it would be this, that care should be taken not to identify the African youth overmuch with the English race. He should go forth from the college to dwell amongst his own people, not to be naturalized amongst strangers. It should be felt by the native chiefs that their children do not cease to belong to them if trained by the Christian. The effort, in short, should be to produce a civilized African, not a bad imitation of an Englishman.

The college has received hitherto a sum of 1000*l.* per annum out of the parliamentary grant for the civilization of Kaffraria. We are glad to find that the principle of endowment has been adopted, and that lands have been acquired by the institution. These, however, can hardly be sufficiently productive for the next five years. During this interval, as the parliamentary grant is on the point of expiring, the college must depend upon voluntary contributions. It is a critical moment in its history. We trust that it will be enabled by the wise liberality of Churchmen at home to continue its operations. It has a great part to play in the civilization of Africa, and will, if its infancy be liberally and wisely reared, eventually secure for its originators a high place in the list of those who have founded institutions which have exercised a commanding influence upon the progress of human life.

Sanitary Science.



PRODUCTION and reproduction is nature's law. The grass, the herb, and the tree, not to mention man himself, were at the first appointed to have seed in themselves, that the work of creation might continue with unimpaired vitality, and that each living thing might be fruitful upon the earth.

Sanitary progress is largely dependent upon the recognition of this principle, and it is not too much to say that, whilst we fail to act upon it, our national economy is largely suffering. *Food producing food*: this is true economy. We write no new thing; S. Jerome, writing of the desert adjacent to Tekoah, the birthplace of the Prophet Amos, says, "No grain whatever is grown upon this dry and sandy soil, it is all full of shepherds, in order, by the multitude of the flocks, to make amends for the bar-

renness of the land." Here we have a very early intimation of the folding of sheep—the most approved system of English farming. The consumption by stock of the produce of a farm is the best assurance against depreciation of land by tenants; manure, by this arrangement is returned to the soil, which the soil itself has been the means of begetting.

The application of the principle has ceased just at the point where the greatest results are within our reach. We have indeed during the past twenty years transformed the social and physical characteristics of the world by our railways and telegraphs and other mechanical appliances; but we have hitherto failed to solve the problem which, to an enormous extent, underlies and affects the well-being of our people, namely, *how to deal with the sewage and refuse of our increasing population*. The subject acquires additional importance every year in the disposition shown by the country to swell the size of our towns. What philanthropy has hitherto failed to do, commercial enterprise would speedily accomplish; but, first of all, whilst the world is as it is, it must be shown that the one is not inconsistent with the other. Let us treat the subject in terms of philanthropy and then in terms of commerce.

Epidemic disease in its various forms will have visited our country to no purpose if we remain unmindful of the comfort and well-being of our poor population. Our own individual security is involved in the consideration, for one plague-spot often proves the infected centre of a very large infected area. Now we require neither medical men nor engineers to convince us that where human dwellings are packed as closely as possible upon the smallest space, some extraordinary measures are absolutely necessary to prevent the spread of disease amongst the overcrowded inhabitants.

Go into the back lanes and alleys of our large towns, and what will you witness? An emaciated and squalid population, little, if at all, removed above the condition of the Maoris who occupy a New Zealand Pah. What wonder! Light, warmth, ventilation, pure water, and house drainage are all wanting, and man exists under circumstances very similar to those under which fish would be expected to live in a pond without the influx of fresh and the efflux of foul water. The case is bad enough; but what shall be said when it is found to exist adjacent to localities where wealth and comfort, ease and luxury, seem to bid defiance to all this world's ills and necessities? Surely the increasing demands of delicacy and refinement in the present day constrain us to say that the "poor are bought for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes."

The ventilation of subjects appears in these days to have taken the place of the ventilation of houses. In ordinary phrase we say that every subject requires to be ventilated; in ordinary practice let us ventilate our houses. The statements of those who have visited the lowest portions of our towns are most appalling. Ten cubit feet of fresh air per hour are necessary for maintaining an adult in health and vigour; this supposes a man to inspire twenty cubic inches of air at each of fifteen inspirations per minute. In cases, many of which are within our personal knowledge, from ten to fifteen persons are found to occupy one very small sleeping apartment, without regard to age or sex; one of the number is struck down by disease, and the corpse is retained for some days amongst the living occupants. As for pure water, this necessary of life is unknown. Water there is in scanty quantity drawn from a well closely adjoining a rudely built cess-pit; percolation is continually going on between the two, till the seeds of disease are contained in the very water used for potable and domestic purposes.

The very idea of such a state of things is so appalling that we feel, whilst we write, that many will be inclined to disbelieve our statement; we will therefore give a case within our own personal knowledge. During the progress of some improvements executed in a cathedral city not long since, it became necessary to dig a deep trench in front of the houses in one of the main streets; the trench was no sooner dug than complaints were made

by the occupiers of houses in the street that their wells were dry. On examination it proved that such was the case; a survey was made of the house-property so affected, and it turned out that the bottom of the trench was seventy feet distant and two inches lower than the wells; at the same time *the wells proved to be within ten feet of cess-pits, and the bottom of the wells was from five to ten feet lower than that of the pit*, and neither wells nor pits were even lined with sound masonry or brick-work. The deplorable instance of the public pump, which was proved to be the means of spreading cholera in London, is well known to all who take an interest in sanitary progress. The retention or exposure of all household refuse takes the place of drainage, and the very walls and foundations become filled with the most destructive impurities.

No wonder that the returns show an *increasing weakness of life in the population of our great industrial centres*. It would exceed the limits of this paper to go into the statistics; they are, however, open to any who will take the trouble to consult the Registrar-General's Reports. No wonder that crime and drunkenness are so rife amongst our people.

Where homes are so wretched, we are constrained to view leniently the habit of resorting to *public-houses*, where, after his day's work, a man may obtain the semblance of comfort denied him at home. We will never join in the opinion that any portion of British workmen is habitually given to drunkenness. That circumstances have made them so we do not deny: the removal of these circumstances is a work to which, in good hope and love, we should apply ourselves.

Now, we cannot adopt the term *preventible death*, used by some writers on this subject; nevertheless facts clearly demonstrate that a large proportion of disease is preventible, and, what is more, *that the prevention admits of clear profit to the nation*.

Frequent analyses have been made by eminent chemists of town sewage, and it may be safely stated to be five times the value of ordinary farm-yard dung, and intermediate between the guano of Saldanha Bay and that of Patagonia. The commercial value of the article *should* ensure its removal from the courts and alleys of our teeming population to a place, where, instead of causing disease and misery, it would fertilize and *improve* the soil. Quality, however, would *not pay* without quantity. Is there, then, quantity sufficient? Professor Liebig states that each individual in an adult population supplies on the average 16½ lbs. of nitrogen per annum: a quantity sufficient to yield the nitrogen of 800 lbs. of wheat, rye, oats, or of 900 lbs. of barley: this is even more than it is necessary to add to an acre of land in order to obtain, with the assistance of the nitrogen absorbed from the atmosphere, the richest possible crop every year.

Water is the most ready and inexpensive mode of conveying this manure; it retains it not in mechanical suspension, as some patentees of manure have alleged, but in chemical combination; and in the known cases of towns of 4000 inhabitants, adequately supplied with water, an amount of not less than 200,000 gallons of sewer water is delivered daily. Now the sewer water of towns in different parts of this country has been carefully examined: we give the results in the cases of Mansfield, London, and Edinburgh. At Mansfield, one gallon of the liquid, evaporated to dryness, gave 77·3 grains of solid matter, containing—

Ammonia	4·02
Sulphuric acid	2·63
Lime	7·10
Chlorine	9·63
Magnesia	1·05
Phosphate of lime	A trace

In London, one gallon of the liquid gave 85·3 grains of solid matter, containing

Ammonia	3·29
Sulphuric acid	0·62
Phosphate of lime	0·29
Lime	6·05
Chlorine	10·00

In Edinburgh one gallon of the liquid gave 78 grains of solid matter, containing—

Ammonia	4.45
Sulphuric acid	3.00
Lime	6.84
Magnesia	A trace
Chlorine	12.10
Phosphate of lime	1.06

It would be impossible, within reasonable limits, to give a statement of the effects produced by sewage irrigation. Let a few instances suffice.

At Edinburgh the meadows between the city and the sea receive a portion of the city drainage, and their value has been raised to a rental of from 20*l.* to 25*l.* the Scotch acre. Between April and October five crops of grass are cut from these meadows, and "the effect of the sewer water is not a sudden impetus followed by reaction and exhaustion, but the land goes on increasing in value according to the length of time the system has been in operation." On a farm in Ayrshire, the tenant states that, with the assistance of sewage irrigation, he has cut from one field 70 tons of grass per acre. He further states that there is not the slightest appearance of exhaustion in the land; its fertility appears to increase. Before the liquid manure was used, the land would not keep more than one bullock or five sheep per acre, it will now maintain five bullocks or twenty sheep per acre, if the crops are cut for stall-feeding. The case of a town within our own personal knowledge may be cited in further proof; this town was completely drained under the powers of the "Public Health Act," and as soon as the works were in operation, a leading farmer of the parish threatened the Local Board with an action at law, setting his damages at 1000*l.*, for an alleged interference with his right to the sewer water of this town, which had for years irrigated a piece of his land, called, from its exceeding richness, "The Land of Canaan." No such right could be established: at the same time this is an instance of the estimate formed by a practical farmer in the West of England of the value of sewer water. Examples of the application of sewage irrigation may be seen in Glasgow, Mansfield, Isleworth, Winchester, Fulham, Liverpool, Tavistock, and many other places in England, as well as in Milan and other continental towns.

If there ever was a case in which two strong motives—personal benefit, on the one hand, and interest in the well-being of our population, on the other—combined in calling us to action, it is this. Why, then, it may well be asked, has there been so little action? After all, in the first stages of science, we are a slow people. How did railways struggle into existence? George Stephenson was regarded as an enthusiast, if not a madman, by a Committee of the House of Commons, when he stated, in advocating the Liverpool and Manchester railway, that he could convey passengers and goods at a speed of ten miles per hour by a locomotive engine. "Suppose a train was actually urged at this speed," said a member of this committee, "and a cow got in the way, would not that be an awkward thing?" "Yes," said the engineer, "very awkward for the cow." Notwithstanding such questionings, railways have changed the face and feeling of our land; and we hesitate not to say that the primitive law of *production* and *reproduction* will yet prevail, notwithstanding the difficulty which has attended the attempts made to carry it out, and that, in proportion to the means taken to remove our refuse from town to country, the brightness of our pastures and the richness of tillage lands will be increased, and we shall not only keep in the country the money which now largely leaves it for the purchase of guano, but we shall in an increased degree enjoy the blessings contained in the phrase,

"Mens sana in corpore sano."

Practical Science.



ORD MACAULAY is not the only writer who has drawn a self-complacent contrast between the new philosophy of England and the old philosophy of Greece; but, as no one else has imparted so much keenness to the comparison, his *Essay on Lord Bacon* may be regarded as the best exposition of a view which is singularly congenial to the spirit of the nineteenth century. It is pleasant to think of all the great things which we have been able to do, and of all the great knowledge which has enabled us to accomplish them; and, just as some people hold that it adds to their own feeling of comfort to think of those who are battling with storm and tempest, while they sit by the fire-side, so we are none the less pleased when we remember that men went on for hundreds, or even thousands, of years without hitting upon any of our marvellous inventions. It is still more pleasant to think that they did so little because they were quite wrong in their road, and that we are doing so much because we have lighted on a path of the existence of which they never dreamed.

Yet, no greater mistake was ever made than when Lord Macaulay asserted that ancient philosophy was wholly and entirely theoretical, and the modern altogether practical. Utility and progress may form the key of the Baconian doctrine; but it is scarcely true to say that Bacon never had before him any other end than utility and progress. Undoubtedly, he believed that both were involved in the development of all true philosophy; but this was because all genuine philosophy aimed at the truth of facts, because it rejected all theories formed on mere speculation or guess-work, and entertained none but those which rested on inductions from actual experience, and challenged the most stringent scrutiny. Truth, then, with all that is implied in the term, was the high spiritual end of the philosophy of Bacon, and the observation of facts was the indispensable means of attaining to it. The description applies quite as closely to the philosophy of Socrates, and of, at least, some few others among the wise men of old time. That there were others, whether in his own or belonging to a later day, who held views as absurd as those of Seneca, proves nothing, unless it can be shown that those views determined the whole course of Greek philosophy; but, as long as the teaching of Socrates and Aristotle remains, we believe that this cannot be done, and the eloquence of Macaulay has been wasted on an ingenious and one-sided exaggeration. To say that, from the days of Democritus to those of Ptolemy, philosophy made no progress—that there was every trace of intellectual cultivation except a harvest—that, with plenty of ploughing, harrowing, reaping, threshing, the garner contained only smut and stubble—is only saying, in effect, that we are very wise and they were very foolish. If we can prove that any one, as did Seneca, spoke of philosophy as disdaining to be useful, we may at once take his words at what they are worth; but we have no right to lay a stress on suspicious anecdotes, which speak of men like Archimedes as ashamed of their own inventions, or as apologizing for their practical discoveries. We need some very strong evidence to warrant the acceptance of stories which are contradicted by the whole tenor of their lives.

But it is needless to beat about the bush. The idea of a radical contradiction in system and essence between the ancient philosophy and the modern has arisen from the fact that the former concerned itself chiefly with Ethics, the latter with Physics; the one analysed human nature, while the other scrutinizes the treasures of the material or sensible world. To infer from this that the system or the principles which have guided modern investigators were unknown in the ancient times, is to assert what is at once unwarrantable and untrue. Unquestionably, the philosophy of Socrates and Aristotle formed no small part

of the collective science of the Greeks; and, however great may have been the differences between these illustrious teachers, it requires no keen discernment to find the common ground which lay beneath them. We purposely omit Plato, because, however eloquently he may have enforced the teaching of his great master, yet his own tendency was rather to draw ideal pictures than to present the bare results of experience. In other words, it was possible to start with premises or principles for which Socrates believed that he had a foundation in fact, and on these to build an elaborate structure of theory; but such a course was really a departure from the spirit of his teaching, not a fulfilment of it.

When Aristophanes represented Socrates as hung up in a basket, in order to fix his mind without distraction on celestial phenomena, he was giving utterance to a libellous falsehood, which could only gain credit with an audience who knew nothing of their man. The judgment of Cicero was an explicit contradiction of this absurd yet powerful caricature. It must have been a bold fiction, even in an age which had no reviews or newspapers, which held up as a mystic and fanatical star-gazer the man who drew philosophy down from heaven to fix it on beings of his own kind. It was scarcely less bold a venture to say that his philosophy, like that of his countrymen in general, "dealt largely in theories of moral perfection, which were so sublime that they never could be more than theories; in attempts to solve insoluble enigmas; in exhortations to the attainment of unattainable frames of mind." If this charge may, with greater or less force, be fastened on Stoics, or any other philosophical school, it is none the less illogical to include the whole class under a description which happens to belong to a part of it. Where in the Socrates, whether of Plato or of Xenophon, are we to look for these sublime and transcendental theories of perfection, and these attempts to solve riddles which defy all efforts to unravel them? To maintain the charge without proof is not only unreasonable, but betrays a complete misunderstanding of the character of his philosophy.

In the age of Socrates, as in our own, there were only two fields for the exercise of human thought. The mind must fasten itself on either the spiritual or the material world. The former would include all things not tangible or sensible, the latter would embrace the science of astronomy not less than that of mechanics or geometry. In both, every man, if he thought at all, would feel instinctively that mere guessing was of little use or none; and the hope of gaining new knowledge, or of working to any purpose, would be determined by the measure in which it was possible to store up facts for experiment and induction. On these two worlds the eye of Socrates sought for materials whence to derive a true and useful knowledge. What was he to do, when he saw what, under the controversies of rival schools, was the real condition of things? The keenest thinkers had thus far concerned themselves chiefly with questions on the essence of being, or on the elementary constitution of the universe. If in astronomy they had heaped up some store of observations, if they had watched the motions of the planets, and recorded the occurrence of unusual phenomena, yet they would not rest content without propounding theories which were to account for everything. Around him raged a very Babel of conflicting speculations. While Heraclitus taught that the light of the stars was fed by exhalations from the earth, Zenophanes held that they were fiery clouds, lit at night and put out in the morning. If Parmenides said that the earth was spherical, and placed at the centre of the universe, Anaxagoras held that it was a plane, and Anaximenes believed that its form of a flat trapezium prevented it from sinking in space. With these might be reckoned a thousand other theories, more or less ingenious, but all grounded on guess-work, and all leading those who accepted them into absurdities more or less extravagant. Here, then, clearly was the pretence of knowledge without the reality, the maintenance of arbitrary hypotheses for which no warrant had, as yet at least, been obtained; and against all such pretences and assumptions it was the mission of

Socrates to wage an uncompromising war. Clearly there were but two courses open to him. Either he must direct philosophy into a new channel, or he must himself furnish the materials for sounder and truer inductions in physical science. To look for the latter from any one man in his day was to expect the accomplishment of a superhuman task. The facts which had been gleaned by observation had not been systematically arranged; there was an abundance of theories to account for phenomena, with scanty records of the phenomena themselves. Yet more, it is unreasonable to look for extraordinary research from any man in a direction to which he is not naturally attracted; and Socrates certainly felt no irresistible temptation to traverse that field of physical research which seemed to be intersected by so many deceptive pathways. In short, he knew that wisdom without the knowledge of facts was worthless, and he saw that philosophers had not arrived at any such knowledge of facts as might hold out the most distant hope of any better theorising hereafter. He found the philosophers, moreover, split up into hostile sections, and he could compare their disputes only to the squabbles of madmen. It was scarcely a matter of surprise that he should take their angry controversies as conclusive evidence that they were meddling with things beyond the comprehension of the human mind, or, as he put it, that they were intruding on a province which the gods kept sacred to themselves. Here, then, no real knowledge could be obtained: it remained to be seen whether there was any field which promised better.

This field he found in human nature. If the mysterious movements of the planets must defy the most patient research, no such veil lay over the constitution of man, the causes and the course of moral action. If a man could not know the stars, he might nevertheless know himself. Here, if anywhere, lay the materials for real knowledge: if these could not be reached, then, in truth, ignorance became no mere negation, but a real and irresistible power. In the moral world he saw, however imperfectly, the working of certain laws: in the physical world he saw none. Possibly he ought to have seen them, and if his mind had in this resembled that of Lord Bacon, he might have seen them: but if we can for a moment think of Bacon as living in the days of Socrates, and as convinced that the subject of physical research and analysis was hopelessly confused, we cannot doubt that, like Socrates, he would have turned his mind in some other direction, and devoted all his energy to discover the laws which govern the moral world. Here, then, Socrates found that there was a real work to be done, and substantial results to be achieved. Here he saw a vast field, which he could scarcely hope to examine thoroughly, and he was content to leave unnoticed the natural world, whose laws it seemed impossible or impious to scrutinise. But, although his mission called him elsewhere, he never attempted to debar others from examining, so far as might be lawful, the phenomena of which he knew nothing. He never depreciated the value of practical astronomy; and his teaching aided rather than arrested the progress of accurate and methodical observation. But, in astronomy as elsewhere, everything was to rest on the truth of facts; his deepest convictions and his keenest longings must be subordinate to sober statements of the actual condition of things. It is a mistake to suppose, as Dr. Hampden seems to suppose, that the idea of his religious mission came first, and the search for real knowledge came afterwards. Doubtless Socrates was most earnest in the inculcation of sound religious principles: but he stood out pre-eminently as the propounder of a new intellectual method rather than as a spiritual teacher. In other words, theory was in him everywhere and under all circumstances subordinate to practical observation of facts.

The protest which Socrates raised against the intricate and baseless systems of the astronomers was repeated by Aristotle against the ideal theories of Plato, and on the same grounds, that such researches were unpractical and could issue in no profitable results. As if still more to show that practice with him rose paramount to all other considerations, the science of Ethics, with its theoretic con-

summation, was made subordinate to Politics, the science of the public and private duties of citizens. Twice then, at least, in the course of Greek philosophy a method was propounded not different in kind from that of Lord Bacon; it failed of producing the tangible results which it achieved in the hands of the latter, simply because the imperfection and scantiness of previous observations rendered it impossible. Beyond this we can draw no sharp contrast. There is a unity in the scientific method of both which it is well not to depreciate. If to hate all pretence of knowledge without the reality, and to assert that all knowledge must arise not from theories but from facts, are proofs of a substantial agreement with the system of Lord Bacon, then the philosophy of utility and progress was not inaugurated in the sixteenth century of the Christian era. If it had not existed in germ in the days of Socrates, we might not have attained now to that mastery over the material world of which we are so proud.

Concerning some of the Poisons of the Day and Night.

WE are certainly not amongst those who believe that any constabulary in the world will put down crime. A policeman will, likely enough, get a nuisance out of sight; but "the most intelligent officer" can scarcely assure us of safety from anything more than the mere parade of active vice. If we are to meet the sin that faces us in our streets we must go deeper than an appeal to the nearest sitting magistrate. We must make it clear to those who fall, not merely that the country has provided for them airy cells, but that the God of all has given to them souls. No one can very well look round and say that, as a nation, we are not doing a great deal to alter the appalling statistics of our criminal population; but if we come to look at results, our congratulations must, after all, be very mixed. Our antidotes have, it is true, been variously blessed; but it is only by comparison that we can at all say that the flow of the worst of our poisons has in any reality been checked. A day or a night in London will bring a fearful cloud over the purest sympathy and the noblest philanthropy. We may have given much; but the evidences of routine crimes are still the unloveliest signs of the best streets. Some of these are dealt with as nuisances, and the House of Correction may shut them out for a time. There are other poisons, however, that we take into our blood knowing well enough what the end must be—whilst believing that it may be postponed. These stimulate our passions, they force our hate, but generally they are commended: and where they are not avoided, the fascination of their malignancy is often openly avowed. The result is that a great many people like to take to their own hearths the poisons which society covers up with sugar. The artizan is startled with the history of successful crime in *Reynolds' Miscellany*, and the higher world goes home to gloat over the polished rancour of the *Saturday Review*. The coarse and the scholarly print, after a different sort, contrives a moral mischief to its readers. It cannot be said that there is no poison where there is so little of charity or love; and malignity is none the less malignant because it may happen to be put smartly, to be covered up in an epigram, or to be refined. We dare say it will be urged that the style of the one puts it quite beyond any comparison with the other; but there is no possibility of denying that the two poisons are prepared to suit the different systems amongst which they are to circulate. The artizan who on Saturday night throws down his penny for *Reynolds' Miscellany* scarcely does more harm to himself than do the thousands for themselves who sit down to enjoy the bitter personalities of the *Saturday Review*. No well-constituted man would put a copy of *Reynolds' Miscellany* in the hands of his groom or gardener. He would not make himself a party to the circulation of

such cheap pollution; but the man who never misses one of the weekly attacks on all creation in the *Saturday Review* tempts himself to become a cynic, and finds himself looking out every Saturday for some smart butchery that is meant to make hearts ache. There are, it is very likely, many who would take up one of these prints who would not soil their fingers with the other. But we are not in the least sure that the bad intention in one direction is more powerless because it happens to be more gracefully arranged. After all, there is really only one category in which you can put all poisons moral or vegetable. There is death at the end of them all. A man who gets a strong liking for reading things that are meant to wound is eating poison, even if he does not know it. When a publication, in all that it says, does no good, it comes at last to do a great deal of harm. The exquisites who are just able to understand that the *Saturday Review* is very smart and very bitter, and who think its abuse of everything and everybody to be very pungent, will think it intolerable that there should be the possibility of any analogy between the careers of vulgar scurrility and educated malevolence. But the mischief done in each case, if it is at all looked into, is in exact proportion. The readers of *Reynolds' Miscellany* are taught to believe in the despotism of a "bloated aristocracy," in the tyranny of a "grasping priesthood," in the crimes of the peerage, and in the easy corruptibility of everything, except Mr. G. W. M. Reynolds and his agents. But the tendency of the *Saturday Review*, if it is in a different direction, is not in any way less morbid. It has taught the middle and upper classes of society to think that week an insufferably dull one that does not hold up to contempt or ridicule the acts or the motives of some statesman, author, philanthropist, or showman; and it is not at all too much to say that the *Saturday Review* has done all this. The minister of state, or the park preacher, or the bug-destroyer, have done service weekly as pegs on which to hang the worst epithets, and the finest writing. The point of the thing is to give pain in neat sentences, and we do not see that it can be held to have failed. There may be those who will say that its antipathies have often been commendable. It would have been sufficiently strange if, in the universality of its invective, there had not sometimes been a rebuke that was deserved. We expect to be told that it has done good service by its treatment of the *Record*. But it does seem to us that it was hardly necessary to remind any one of the mischief, to anything but political religion, that is done either by the *Record* or the *Guardian* newspapers; and when every canon of criticism has been in turn outraged, it only seems reasonable to suppose that the *Record* was noticed because it happened to be the readiest thing to tear to pieces. The poison, indeed, in the instance of the *Saturday Review* is only so much the worse because it is often so cleverly compounded. And many men have at last come to confess that they cannot do without it. They like to see the fall of the lash that is to make a human being writhe. They must at last get this wretched stimulant every week; and they reason themselves effectively into the belief that there can be no harm in it, because so many of the hardest things are written by clergymen. *Now journals which have a faith and a policy are bound to censure freely where there is a cause. Journals which, like the Saturday Review, have no faith and no policy, cannot censure; they can only revile.*

The effect of all this is the effect of poison. It becomes a matter of competition who can wound the most; and the man who has been the best at this throughout the year is seated next to the management at the annual Greenwich dinner. The public seem to have their own opinion, and are very sure they like it; and exactly as this liking strengthens is the poison shown. They like the sneer, the taunt, the imputation; they get to like all this because it gives pain; and if they would only look into the source of it all they would come upon—poison. The print that Mr. Reynolds offers for a penny with an illustration is coarse, and ill-written, and detestable, and urges just what the *Saturday Review* would think contemptible.

But we are very sure that however much it may have outraged good taste, whatever libels it may have conveyed in its woodcuts, and reiterated in its letter-press, that in its intention to distort and give pain it has a successful rival in the *Saturday Review*. Intellect and ignorance here have met; and in the sixpenny and the penny sheet the poison to those publics to which they appeal is quite the same. These may seem all that they really are, and be only an offence against every moral law; and the worst poisons are not at all necessarily those that may be brought to light by the policeman's bulls-eye. *Essays and Reviews* were an illustration of this, and now the Bishop of Natal has given us some more out of the same phial. The antidote is, however, very near, if we only knew where to look for it; and there may be, it is very true, more of these moral poisons than there used to be—but there are the means just now of staying their course that there never were before. That there are others with which it is a great deal harder to deal is equally true; and they can only be at all met by those helps that the law of the land supplies. A man may corrupt himself up to a certain point without any hindrance, except that which may be afforded by his conscience or a friend; but there are some abominations that are so infectious that they are almost crimes; and those who cannot decide for themselves what they should avoid are paternally protected from the poisons by which they are fascinated. The Middlesex magistrates have very properly refused to renew the licence to the Cyder Cellars. We are not going into the question here as to what places should be, or should not be open in London at night; but whilst the Cyder Cellars were tolerated it was not easy to see what could be bad enough to be shut up. The *Judge and Jury* has been one of the nuisances of London long enough; and those whose business it is to interfere have very properly at last reduced the Cyder Cellars to the level of an unlicensed pest. The people, it is true, read *Cain* after the Court of Chancery told Lord Byron it was not within its province to protect the copyrights of blasphemy; and we dare say the Cyder Cellars' gang will not be disheartened; but it is something to know that one of the thoroughfares of London is rid of such a foul impurity. We do not mean to suppose at all an extreme instance of the sort of harm these places do. A young man is sent up to see what is called a little life, and learn some business or profession. He is sure to have some one else of his own age to show him about. There is the theatre the first night, and after that supper, and the kidneys at the Cyder Cellars were always very good. We are not going to defile our columns with any account of this execrable place; but we may just say that he would have found himself in the midst of a mock trial, with the Divorce Court parodied, and every obscene detail received with acclamation. He did not see a policeman at the door, and his friend assures him that it is quite the properest place to get his supper. It may all seem—all that he sees and hears—pollution; but it is explained away. It is one of the liveliest entertainments of the night; and after a little bit he begins to think he will spend an hour every evening in its foetid air. There are places to which a man can go, and to which he is only told by the law he should not go to: but until about a month ago the propriety of the Cyder Cellars was confirmed by the bench of magistrates; and if a man condemned it, his judgment was in advance of that which was magisterial.

It was one of the worst poisons because no one thought of openly assailing it, and while it lasted, we are quite sure that its detestable influence was scarcely ever approached. One night in that accursed room has poisoned the life-blood in many a young heart, and swelled the bed-roll of the Devil's own. A mere boy may have gone in there to eat kidneys and to be amused; he came out polluted and fit to be in any direction further defiled. If he goes to his bed he is haunted with the filthy jest and shameless indelicacy which came from the foul lips of the mock judge. He cannot think of his home that he has just left. He cannot look at the clasped Book that his mother gave

him, and which his sister wrapped in the flannel waistcoats which he was to be sure to wear. He cannot think of the pure lives of that home after the night which he has gone through. But he will not face the conviction that he has been doing very wrong. People with great names were pointed out to him, and the Middlesex magistrates licensed it all. And so he would go again and again, and then he was ready for those orgies to which even the Cyder Cellars were as a clean thing. But one sanctioned poison of the night the less courses now through the streets of London—there is one protected pollution the less through which our youth can go; the outrage of the Cyder Cellars has at last been stayed.

We have quite lately had brought before us the experiences of one who had seen the hideous heathenism of London from nightfall almost till the fourth small hour. It was purposed to see not only all that was bad, but to see it all at its very worst. Whitechapel was reached before the evening was old, and three detectives did the honours of the introduction. We are not going to tell all that was seen; but we may at once say that nothing like the reality of the scene could be ever told. The intention was to miss nothing, and the experiences of the police decided that this would be the best achieved in S. George's-in-the-East. Neither by night nor day is there any lull there in the occupation of the thief in the horrible dens of those tainted streets. They reached the outskirts in a cab, and then they were in the presence of crimes that have scarcely even names. A moment of separation from the police, and it is not likely the experiences of that night would have travelled beyond the spot where they were gathered. By only a special mercy would they have been granted their lives when they lost their clothes. As they went on the police pointed out the thieves who were of mark, and those who were mere beginners of considerable promise. They stopped before one house where all the crusts that are begged in the streets are turned into gin. The infamy of all seemed very equal, but in the competition the men were clearly surpassed by the women. Everybody blasphemed at intervals, except the women, who never stopped at all. It occurred to those who went there that night to ask if it was always as bad as that? And the answer of the detectives was that it was ten times worse on Saturdays and Mondays. If everybody swore, and cursed, and scoffed, and blasphemed on the "off" nights, it was not easy to believe what their occupation could be on the other five. There were old men and old women, everything that is made after the image of God, down to the little child; and the foulness of all was equal. It was fearful to hear the words that rolled from the lips of the crone who was full of years and spirits; but it was agony to hear the curses stream from the baby mouths when midnight had passed and it was far away in the morning. "This is the worst street in London," said the chief officer; "there is no man, woman, or child here, who is not either a thief or learning to steal. There is not a woman who is not a harlot or who does not mean to be one. Were I to leave you for a moment you would be surrounded and stripped."

And this is London; this is what we can point to—God and man alike defied—in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was very hard to believe the officer when he said, "The parson cannot come here, they would kill him if he did." Now we do not want to believe that this is true—all we ask is, is it? If it is true, the Church is not doing her work. That which was seen that night goes on through every day and night of every week of every year, and the constable is seen and not the clergyman. We have been dealing with poisons that could be counted; but here it is all poison, all darkness, all death. The man is born and dies and never lifts his voice or eyes to Heaven, but with some cry or menace of horrible profanity. Are these acres of souls to be born and fetched away, and we in the West look on? Is the South African man-eater to hear about God before the Whitechapel bird-catcher is told of his soul? Almost within hearing of the city life of London there are thousands at this hour only calling upon devils.

Is the Church to tell of what she is doing in the

West, whilst Hell has her own in the East? We dare say there may be fearful perils in the Church's way; we dare say that many who may go there after souls will be cast out, perhaps without their coats, perhaps without anything; but is it to be in London that the Church is to say, "I have gone far enough, I *dare* not go further?" The literary infidels are not afraid—they go there and leave their pennyworths of poison to tempt in the windows. The "advanced Liberals" are not afraid. Is the *Daily Telegraph* to get a start of the Bible? The Church may have been in the midst of these things, and may as yet have been driven back. We only know what the detective said; but if she has, she must come again and again, or what will be her plea at the end of the world? We shall always have poisons if we are scared away from their source. We may talk of our alms, of our philanthropy, of our missions, of our treatment of the cares of the castaway; but a night in the chief city of the world will tell to us its citizens, that if what we have done is much, that which lays before us is immeasurable; and that in the midst of our high civilization we have yet our own heathen to save.

Respite and Reprieve.



It is no paradox to say that the general recognition of the soundness of a principle is at times unfavourable to its practical working. The very fact that every one agrees that it ought to be carried out seems to exonerate every one from feeling it necessary to take care that it is carried out; and the confidence with which we take its adoption as a rule of conduct for granted blinds us to violations of it which pass under our own eyes. There seems at this moment to be no small risk that the due administration of the law, in the case of the greatest crimes which fall under its cognizance, may come to be neglected, just because the whole nation is unanimous that it is for the general interest that it should be most strictly maintained; and because, consequently, the great majority of the public take it for granted that it is strictly maintained. We have been led into this train of thought by one or two startling reprieves which have of late been granted to convicted murderers. Our neighbours the French have, of late years, brought the comparative impunity which they grant to such criminals to a regular system. Their juries pronounce nearly all such crimes to be attended with "extenuating circumstances;" and such a verdict does not involve the penalty of death. Their ideas of what such circumstances are may in some degree be gathered from the report of two cases lately mentioned in the *Times*. A man named Dathy, seventy years of age, but of notoriously bad character, having previously been twice convicted of stabbing people, was tried for the murder of a travelling tinker. He had ascertained him to be possessed of money which he carried about his person: so he watched him into a barn, whither he repaired to sleep, and, while he slept, he stabbed him to the heart, and carried off his money. He was convicted on the clearest evidence: but his crime was stated by the jury to be accompanied by "extenuating circumstances," and he was sentenced to twenty years of hard labour—which, of course, he is not likely to live to complete. In another case a man of the name of Peyrier was indicted for the murder of a farmer named Michel: and Mdme. Michel was also indicted as an accessory before the fact. Peyrier had had an intrigue with the woman; her husband had found it out, and had threatened, perhaps attempted, to revenge himself on the paramour. On this the woman began to persuade her lover to murder her husband. Letters from her, full of advice and entreaties that Peyrier would murder him, had been discovered, and were produced on the trial. The murder itself was clearly brought home to the man. Michel had received two gun-shot wounds in his back; and had had his skull fractured by blows from some heavy weapon. The

bullets found in the dead body fitted Peyrier's gun; and on the broken gun-stock his victim's hairs were still sticking when he was arrested. This crime, too, was found by the French jury to have been committed "under extenuating circumstances;" and, consequently, the murderer and his instigator are only sent to hard labour. No doubt many an Englishman who read the reports shuddered when he thought, that, at the distance of scarcely twenty miles from our shores, a desire to possess oneself of a traveller's hoard, or a neighbour's wife, should be considered so valid a temptation to slaughter the possessor, that a murder committed with such an object must, of necessity, be accompanied by "extenuating circumstances." But are we not in England rapidly coming to the same state of things; or, if *certainty* of punishment be the greatest preventive of crime, to even a worse state?

The evil of which we complain, has had a singular origin. The prerogative of mercy in all kingdoms belongs to the Crown: and in England, till the present reign, every capital case was submitted to the Sovereign in person, and his or her pleasure taken as to the execution, or commutation, or remission, of the sentence. But on, or shortly after the accession of her present Majesty, from the desire to relieve her from the discharge of a very trying duty, this authority was vested in the Home Secretary. For some years the formal change produced no practical effect on the working of the law; but latterly, it has become the fashion, when a murderer has been convicted and sentenced to death, for him or her, and his or her relations, to get up a petition to the Home Secretary, setting forth a number of circumstances, which, of course, were alleged on the trial and disregarded, or considered as outweighed by others; and, urging that they ought to have made the jury hesitate, to entreat the Home Secretary to inquire further into the case. He, according to the new fashion, accedes to the petition, at once sends down a respite, and delegates to some one whom he selects the task of instituting a fresh enquiry. Even when this fresh enquiry has resulted in finding no facts favourable to the prisoner, the respite has been carried out into a reprieve, because after the criminal had been tantalised with a hope of getting off, it would have been cruel to hang him: but more commonly the commissioner to whom the conduct of the new enquiry has been committed, having been appointed on purpose to discredit the verdict of the jury, has yielded to the bias which he knew he was expected to entertain; has thrown doubts upon the magnitude or the completeness of the crime; and the prisoner has been pardoned or subjected to some less awful punishment.

Thus, some few years back, a man who had committed bigamy with a woman who, unhappily for herself, had property enough to tempt his cupidity—and who, after compelling her to make a will in his favour, poisoned her by inches, feasting his eyes with her dying agonies, got his case revised, and actually obtained a pardon! though, if the minister who granted it doubted his guilt, he certainly did not share that doubt with one other human being. And now we read that a woman in Scotland, who has been convicted of murder on the very clearest evidence, and who has made her crime, if such a thing be possible, doubly black, by trying to shift the accusation on an innocent old man, has been able to obtain a respite while the Home Secretary instituted a fresh enquiry into the case; and this has been followed by a reprieve, the ground for which, as stated by the Minister's Secretary, is more strange than the reprieve itself. We are told that the result of the enquiry has satisfied Sir George Grey that "sufficient doubt did exist on the share which the prisoner Jessie Mc'Lachlan had in the commission of the crime, to justify a commutation of the capital sentence." In other words, a doubt whether she was innocent or guilty; for partly innocent and partly guilty she could by no possibility have been. Hitherto the rule that a prisoner was to have the benefit of such a doubt has been understood to mean that if such a doubt were entertained on solid grounds he was to be acquitted altogether; but now it is interpreted

by the highest authority as signifying that if it be certain that an accused person has committed a murder, he is to be hanged. If it be uncertain whether he committed it or had nothing to do with it, he is to be condemned to penal servitude.

But since the reprieve of Mrs. M'Lachlan another case has occurred resembling hers in one most important feature, the attempt to fix the blame on an innocent person. A man named Gardiner having murdered his wife, and having sought to fix the guilt on a wretched woman, who was his mistress, was convicted and sentenced to death. Petitions in his favour were presented to the Home-Secretary. If we are to believe the newspapers, he at first refused to listen to them; alleging that he saw no reason to doubt the verdict or disturb the sentence: but by their importunity he has been wrought upon so far to change his opinion, as to commute the sentence of death into one of penal servitude. We should like to know which part of his original opinion Sir G. Grey changed in this instance. One would suppose it cannot have been that portion which decided that a murderer deserved to die; for on the same morning that Gardiner was to have been executed, another criminal found guilty of the same offence, under, to say the least, not more aggravating circumstances, was executed according to his sentence. If we are to imagine that he changed that portion of his opinion which considered the convicted man's guilt undeniably proved, we shall almost be forced to the conclusion that the way to raise doubts in the mind of the Home Secretary is to try to fix the blame on an innocent person. It is needless to point out to what a horrible system of defence this would invite every accused person. Yet, on any other grounds it seems wholly impossible to account for these two reprieves, as for many others that have recently been granted. In granting such an enquiry in any case the minister is establishing a Court of Appeal in cases of murder of which no English or Scotch lawgiver ever dreamt; and which is at variance with the whole system and spirit of the jurisprudence of both countries. The code of each nation has provided that an accused person shall be tried before a sworn jury of impartial and competent men, aided and presided over by a sworn judge, a lawyer of acknowledged learning and experience, the greater part of whose life has been spent in sifting and weighing evidence: that the jury shall form their opinion on the testimony of sworn witnesses; while, after their verdict has been delivered, the judge, though theoretically only an officer appointed to give effect to their decision, does, by the power vested in him of apportioning the punishment, practically act as its reviewer when it is adverse to the prisoner. When the verdict is one of acquittal this power is not called into action at all. But when it has been one of condemnation, there is no instance of the extreme penalty of the law having been allowed to take effect when the judge who tried the case has not been fully satisfied of its justice.

But now, in opposition to this sworn and impartial jury, and to this sworn and experienced judge, forming their opinion on the testimony of witnesses on their oath, a new tribunal is set up. Some gentleman, who may or may not have experience, conducts an enquiry, on *ex parte* statements; not sworn to; not sifted by cross-examination; not even tested by being carried on in open court and before the face of prosecutor or prisoner. And the nation at large is expected to be satisfied with his reversal of the formal verdict of the court of law. Such a state of things appears to be fraught with the greatest possible evils. We do not hesitate to say that the Home Secretary ought not to have such power: he ought not to be subjected to such solicitations. There cannot possibly in the previous career that has qualified him for his present post be any guarantee that he is competent to try such questions, or to resist such appeals to his humanity. Such cases ought to be decided by calm deliberate judgment. When petitions, like those of which we are speaking, are presented to a minister, the petitioners are seeking to act on his nerves. It is no slight thing for a man who, from having been a

literary man, or an easy-going country gentleman, or a nobleman whose attention has been pretty equally divided between his political duties, the claims of society, and the care of his estates, has suddenly become a minister, to be told that the life or death of a fellow-creature depends on his obduracy or his flexibility. It is an unfair tax on the nerves of such a man, desirous, as all men are, to avoid the shedding of blood, to be told that if he, by his fiat, rejects enquiry into a plausible case (and how few cases are incapable of being represented plausibly), the blood of a fellow-creature will lie at his door. The more amiable the man, the less is he calculated to resist such an appeal *ad misericordiam*. We do not desire to see a Court of Appeal in criminal cases instituted at all. In cases of acquittal it could not possibly be called into action; and in cases of conviction we are abundantly satisfied that the merciful spirit of English law has fenced round accused persons with so many precautions that it is scarcely possible to produce an instance of an unjust and unrighteous conviction. But if it should seem fit that there should still be a power of revision, it is quite clear in what kind of court that power should be lodged. It should not be one of authority in its very nature inferior to that which has pronounced the first decision. In civil cases the appeal is from one judge to the Bench of Judges; from a vice-chancellor to a lord-chancellor; from both to the House of Peers; not from a judge or a vice-chancellor to a stipendiary magistrate or a revising barrister. And how can that which would not be tolerated for a moment, as a last tribunal in cases where the property of an individual is concerned, be admissible in a case where the whole nation is so much interested as in the due punishment of atrocious criminals? It is, therefore, clear that, if the rule is to be established that there is to be, under a system which whatever may be said of it in theory is, in practice, new and strange, a power lodged somewhere to review the verdict of juries in the case of convictions for murder, a competent court ought to be established for that purpose; and that the power of bringing such cases under review ought to be limited by the same restrictions to which the right to obtain a new trial in civil cases is also subject. The prisoner should no more be able to obtain a revision of his case on his own petition than a plaintiff or defendant in a civil action. It should be granted moreover only in cases where important facts bearing upon the case, but which were not before the judge and the jury, have come to light.

We have no wish to see such a system established, or such a tribunal erected; but, if the system is to prevail, we are sure that the country will not long be satisfied without such a tribunal. In the meantime, though we confess our knowledge of Publius Syrus to be limited to that which is to be obtained from the title-page of the *Edinburgh Review*, we will so far make use of what we have thus learnt as to remind Sir G. Grey, *judex damnatur cum nocens absolvitur*.

Reason v. Conscience.

II. The Poet.

"So then, there be four men in whom oftentimes this conflict between the conscience and the reason doth arise, and where reason is apt to prevail; the literate, or scholar; the poet; the theologist; and the politician."—SIRION.



IN the SCHOLAR, chosen for our first example, we saw how the battle went. Without a moment's misgiving, absolute, clear dominion was given to the sway of the intellect; the inner life of the man was fairly trampled out; and he became a very superior, keen, calculating machine, of great power, and dexterity sufficient to lay down laws for the government of the universe, while he failed in gaining the least knowledge of his own being. As he had begun, so he was content to go on to the end, satisfied, apparently, with the

fruit of the knowledge he had gathered; unwilling to receive any higher, purer light. In the POET this strife rarely reaches so acute a crisis. He is himself a *Poet* (ποιητής), a doer, a creator of human beings, things, and thoughts, in that wide domain where imagination and fancy are apt to run riot; where, instead of being his ministering servants, they are apt to become his masters; to lead him hither and thither captive at their will. Double need, therefore, has the poet of some certain, safe anchorage in the great sea of speculation, doubt, reverie, and wandering imagination; of some power that shall aid him as a judge, decide for him as a court of appeal, and so help him to stronger light and deeper conviction. For if the strife of Reason against Conscience arise in him, and he has no such appeal, neither faith to make it, nor to trust in it when made, his peace of mind is shipwrecked at once and for ever. He can never be still because of the incessant and restless activity of his mind; keenly alive, and keenly sensitive, he is always setting out on what seem to him small voyages into the wide and deep waters. He is not content to be on the land of fact and reality, and is never so happy as when he can sail along the edges of known facts and cherished beliefs, marking the sunlight and the shadow, the passing bark and the fickle waters, the cloudy line of horizon

"Where ships and shadows heaving lie,
And land and sea and mist together blend."

The power of doing this, and delight in doing it, is one of the gifts of poesy; but it is not the only, nor the chief gift. The art or power of sailing vaguely away across summer or winter seas, without actually striking on a reef, may be so far great and good, but it is not the mission of the true poet, nor will it content him. He must make a voyage out and home again with a definite object, bringing back with him a goodly freight

"Of jewels, precious gold, and merchandize
Of ripe experience, and of garnered truth."

And to do this he must have on board his ship a trusty compass, or suddenly he may strike on a hidden rock in the midst of sunny, smooth waves, or be dashed headlong on a lee-shore when he fancies he has before him the open sea. Nothing will supply the place of the compass. He may have skill as a navigator, courage, resolution, knowledge of the waves, winds, and currents; but without this guide he neither knows his own position nor the shores he is passing, leaving behind, or those which lie beyond the setting sun. A profitless voyage or a fatal shipwreck is the inevitable result.

As an example of this vague, profitless course, of a ship without a compass, of wasted knowledge and of fruitless skill, of a long, weary voyage, that brought neither gold nor content, we cannot do better than take a recent volume of *Poems*, by Arthur Hugh Clough, Fellow of Oriel, &c. &c. As far as mere seamanship was concerned, he was well and nobly fitted to bring the longest voyage to a glorious and happy end, laden with spoils of all lands. Science, skill, knowledge were his; noble eagerness for toil, unselfish thirst for what was good and true; absolute defiance of wind and tide, if he thought that the way to the true land was against them. And yet he failed; he was shipwrecked at mid-day, and in calm water. Either the compass on board was not looked at, or from neglect and disuse it had become out of order and faulty.

Clough was captain of Rugby School under Arnold, when Rugby was at its height of fame. As a mere youth, at Oxford he carried off the Balliol Scholarship, and then attained the still higher honour of a Fellowship at Oriel, then being only in his twenty-third year. His after-life we have no need to trace here, but as it tended to show the growth and nobleness of a mind which is described by one who knew him well as active, lively, and speculative. His great and early cry, like Mr. Buckle's, was for freedom of opinion and of speech, "liberation from archæological formulas," and a wider range of studies; loving justice and truth with passion and intensity, we are told, and inclining to look favourably on the claims of the feeble and the feel-

ings of the poor; high-minded, unselfish, and earnest. These qualifications, of which one or two are rather vague, present a strange mixture as a whole, and contain the elements of good. But in spite of all these noble qualities and noble aspirations, intellect alone seems to have been his guide; and this, as a motive power, led him hastily and lightly forward, the gay and lofty sails of imagination and fancy carrying him on over the swift and glancing waters, in spite of many misgivings and infinite doubts, to the very end. Of these misgivings, fond regrets, and troublous doubts, his early poems are full; while in his later pages, as the reader may see, fears, doubts, and misgivings have no utterance. They appear to have ceased mainly because conscience had ceased to speak. "*The war of conscience and conviction*" (as his biographer vaguely calls it) that had to be "carried on until some clearer light should break upon the inquirer," seems to have come to an end; but of the *clearer light*, less clouded faith, and more settled, certain hopes, there is no trace. The things which perplexed him in the beginning troubled him to the last; "the riddle of life" was still unriddled; and though the voice of misgiving no longer spoke out, the old stock of wavering, hesitating, negative unquiet, had never been rooted out.

No sooner was his brilliant success at Oxford achieved,—ere his restless spirit could find sufficient and suitable work,—than the leaven of the strife within began to show itself. If he looked more closely within at the mystery of his own inner life, the result of his search seems to have forced him to confess his own weakness, and to cry out—

"How little canst thou tell
How much in thee is ill or well."

The thought of any higher power which, if he sought it, would help his weakness, would cleanse and strengthen the witness of good and evil within him, never seems to have dawned on him for a moment. Nor, if he looked out on the world, was it much better. All there seemed so cloudy and confused that his very faith in a Ruler of the universe almost fails him. He can but exclaim—

"O Good and Great
In whom, in this bedarkened state,
I fain am struggling to believe."

His biographer talks of the *bitter irony of fate* as a controlling power over the destinies of man, and again in a like spirit of the *blind fury* fate measuring out his years for him; and with this view the poet himself coincides. We are told that "his speculative activity was beyond his powers of co-ordination, and that the discursive element was too dominant." These are rather vague words, but they clearly point to an evil which could only be remedied by the bright clear flame of a healthy conscience whose continual promptings were looked for and obeyed, kept alive by constant reference, and fed by that greater Light from which springs its whole life. Of any such living flame, any such promptings, or such obedience, his poems afford us no trace. Upright, earnest, and keenly sensitive; shy, and yet like all reserved men, at times most communicative, pouring out his inmost thoughts without reserve, we look in vain for this controlling power. Controlling power was precisely what he needed. On his return to England in 1853, he says, "there are deeper waters of ancient knowledge and experience about one here, and one is saved from the temptation of flying off into space." But this very temptation to fly off was the one to which he was continually giving way. The waters of *knowledge* were ever tempting him, and to their voice he listened. Is it to be wondered at that at last he exclaims—

"Knowledge is painful often; and yet, when we know, we are happy;
Seek it; and leave mere faith and love to come with the chances."

Anywhere, or anywhither, hither and thither over the wide and troubled waves was his bark driven; the sport of idle winds that he should have known how to make fill his sails, of wandering currents which should never have led him astray from the course to which the compass

pointed! If, indeed, a voice recalled him across the rolling foam, or the smooth rippling waters, it had no power over him, but fell dead on his ear. Where "faith and love are left to come with the chances," no other voice has a chance of being heeded. The reply is ready at once—

"Come back! whither or for what?
To finger idly some old Gordian knot,—
Unskilled to sunder, and too weak to cleave,
And with much toil attain to half-believe."

This is *his own* answer to his own misgiving, but not the answer which his conscience would have returned. It is no work for a Christian soldier to *finger idly*, but to *cut boldly* the Gordian knot; if "unskilled to sunder," not to sit down and moan over his helplessness, but to seek mightily for skill where it *can* be found; never to be content with the miserable fragments of half-belief, but to toil mightily on till he attain the reward of full and loving faith. The difficulties that beset a man, the doubts which perplex him, the misgivings which haunt him gather strength from a spirit of lawless rejection of all authority; and from claiming that the intellect alone is able to discover, to measure, to attain, to explain all things. Mr. Clough, possibly, would at one time have scarcely denied this; but having once raised the banner of freedom, and deliverance from every formula, the authority within him, the standard to which many a doubt might have been referred was slurred over, neglected, and forgotten. The process by which this state of negation is reached may be slow, but the end is inevitable; and it gradually overtook him. He never sank, as *Buckle* did, to the paltry belief of sophism that the whole universe is but a vast complicated machine, working on in certain fixed cycles, under the sway of an unseen but unknown motive power. Dust and ashes of this kind would never have quenched his thirst. He *does*, though it be feebly, confess the existence of an actual God, going by him unseen, passing him unperceived. But this is all. Faith will *not* come by chance; but only to those who count chance in such matters a lie. To the great Being whom Clough owned, he never turned as to one who could sever light from darkness, who could separate the precious from the vile within him, and clear his conscience from all unworthy doubts and fears. Nor is this all.

Like the heroes of Mr. Kingsley's novels, he seems to take it for granted that doubting, surmising, and denying is a safe path towards the truth; with this essential difference, that the land of certainty, quiet conviction, and peace which they found so easily in the pages of romance, he in the land of the living never found at all. It may be said that neither Mr. Clough, nor any one of the poets belonging to his school, ever asserts this in so many words; and this we admit. But, all defiance or evasion of the truth—now-a-days—is vague, indistinct, and contradictory. Error spreads in *nubibus*, and enlarges the domain of unbelief by constant tampering with the edes of belief. And it is in this way that open, direct, falsehoods are propagated under the shadow of half timid, vague, wandering negation. It is this spirit of sneering speculation which leads a man to ask,—as if in doubt,—

"Where lies the land to which the ship would go?
Far, far away, is all her seamen know.
And where the land she travels from? Away,
Far, far behind, is all that they can say."

And at last, naturally, hurries him on into wilder extravagance of speculation, deeper doubt, and darker confusion. It is *not* true that all that a Christian knows of the land to which he goes is that it is far, far away; nor of the earth which he leaves that it is far, far behind. Every man who believes in the New Testament, knows and believes infinitely more than this. But he who once gives way to what a keen writer calls "*these random scatterings of uneasiness*," sows with his own hand the seeds of future error, strife, and confusion. Having once prophesied that he knows nothing of the land to which he goes but that it is distant, or of this world but that it is slipping from him, no wonder that he comes to regard *duty—his work in this life*—as no better than this wretched equivocation,—

"DUTY,—'tis to take on trust,
What things are good, and right, and just;
And whether indeed they be, or be not,
Try not, test not, feel not, see not.
'Tis the coward acquiescence,
In a destiny's behest;
Sacrificing aye the essence
Of all that's truest, noblest, best."

Any description of duty less Christian, or more false than this it is hard to imagine. Yet he who drew it was a Christian, and had no intention of being false. We have tried to show the secret root of his error, and to account for his wandering from the truth. His life was one of broken, wasted strength. All through it he seemed to be groping feebly after duty. Can it be wondered at that, with such an ideal before him, his search was a failure? When taunted with the question, *What is duty?* he should have gone beyond the spirit of his own better words,—

"I know not, I will do my duty."

If he had but *done* this, without questioning, then he would have *known* more, far more, than he lived to know. His fatal mistake was an early one, and waylaid him to the last. When doubts first beset him, he says, in all sadness,—

"I rose, I turned the key, I let them in,
First one, anon another, and at length
In troops they came; for, how could I who once,
Had let in one, *nor looked him in the face*,
Show scruples e'er again? There, there, they sit
In my heart's holy place."

In that heart's holy place should have shone the light of *conscience*, not of *reason*; to that light should every intruding enemy have been summoned. But, instead of flying to the light, he cries out to darkness to help him, as a child hurrying to its mother's lap; "So to thee," he exclaims,—

"O Mother Night, come I! within the folds
Of thy dark robe hide thou me close."

Thus are brought to shipwreck, without bearing half their due fruit, the lives of noble and earnest men; energies are wasted, opportunities lost, long years squandered in a strife which, under proper guidance, they might have entirely mastered, and thus risen to the true and only freedom, that springs from obedience, and leads on to victory.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS.

CTOBER 12.—General Butler announces that no plea of neutrality will be received from native inhabitants of New Orleans; that all refusing to take the oath of allegiance are enemies of the United States, and must send their names and a list of their property to the Provost-Marshal.

October 13.—The Confederate General Stuart, with his whole force, recrosses the Potomac at Edward's Ferry into Virginia, carrying away 1,000 horses and large quantities of clothing taken in Pennsylvania.

October 14.—At a large Democratic ratification meeting, held at New York, resolutions passed requiring the Administration to fulfil its promise to carry on the war constitutionally, condemning President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, and denouncing the suspension of the writ of *Habeas Corpus*. The Republicans denounced as a party advocating revolution.

October 15.—At a Democratic meeting held in Brooklyn resolutions passed pledging Democracy to restore the Union as it was and to maintain the Constitution as it is, denouncing arbitrary arrests and interference with the freedom of the press. President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation declared unwise in policy and bad in principle, securing an united South, but making a disunited North.

October 17.—A portion of General M'Clellan's army advances from Harper's Ferry, and occupies Charlestown, in Virginia, afterwards continuing its advance two miles beyond Charlestown. General M'Clellan's head-quarters at Charlestown.

October 21.—Revolution in Greece and abdication of King Otho.

October 30.—M. Drouyn de Lhuys issues a circular, proposing mediation in America, to the cabinets of London and St. Petersburg.

October 31.—The Provisional Government everywhere recognized throughout Greece. The citizens and university students organize a guard for the capital. The private property of the King and Queen delivered to their Majesties.

November 1.—The King and Queen of Greece arrive at Munich.

The Dean and Chapter of Canterbury Cathedral elect Dr. Longley, Archbishop of York, to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, in accordance with the recommendation accompanying the Royal *congé d'élire*.

Parliament prorogued from the 13th inst. to the 14th of January.

The Queen in Council declares her consent to the marriage of the Prince of Wales to the Princess Alexandra of Denmark.

The voting on the project for the total revision of the Swiss Federal constitution takes place at Lucerne. The proposition rejected by 16,000 against 10,000 votes.

November 3.—The canton of Basle rejects the project by 3,738 votes against 581.

The Confederate steamer *Alabama* captures eight more American vessels and destroys them all but two, which give bonds for 86,000 dols., payable to President Davis after the declaration of peace. The *Alabama* last seen in lat. 39, long. 69 W., off Cape Delaware, directly in the track of the Californian steamers.

The Federal forces advance slowly in Virginia.

The returns of the elections continue to show considerable Democratic gains throughout the country.

Horatio Seymour, the Democratic candidate, carries the election in New York city by over 30,000 majority. His majority in the whole State estimated at 10,000; elected Governor of the State.

The Democrats chosen in New York, Benjamin Wood and Fernando Wood being both elected to Congress.

In New York State nineteen Democrats and twelve Republicans elected to Congress. New Jersey chooses Democrats by a large majority. Governor Andrew re-elected in Massachusetts. Michigan elects Republicans.

November 5.—Their Royal Highnesses Prince Christian and Princess Alexandra of Denmark, arrived at Osborne on Wednesday night, in her Majesty's ship *Black Eagle*, from the Continent.

November 7.—Dr. Thomson, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, appointed to the Archbishopric of York, vacant by the translation of Dr. Longley to the See of Canterbury.

November 9.—The Turkish Envoy protests against the demand made by the Provisional Government on Greeks residing in all countries to send deputies to the Greek Chambers. The Porte, on the other hand, recognizes the passports signed by the Provisional Government.

November 10.—General McClellan is relieved from the command of the army of the Potomac, and General Burnside is appointed his successor.

England and Russia decline the proposed mediation in America.

Baron Gros succeeds Comte De Flahault as ambassador of France to England.

November 15.—Lord Palmerston elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, by a majority of 82 over the Lord Justice Clerk; 556—474.

Mr. Gladstone re-elected Rector of Edinburgh University.

November 22.—A despatch of the Danish Minister of Foreign affairs, to the Danish Envoy in London published, in which all the propositions contained in the despatch of Earl Russell, relative to Schleswig-Holstein, are declared to be inadmissible.

REVIEWS.

Tupperism.*



AFTER dealing with men of genius like THACKERAY, DICKENS, KINGSLEY, and BULWER, it may seem strange to our readers to come down to the platitudes of *Tupper*. But Tupperism is now a fact of such gigantic dimensions that it forces itself on our notice. When an author prints "*CIVth Thousand*" on his title-page, it will not do to ignore his existence, or simply to label his productions as so many volumes of windy, pompous trash. In these days of bookmaking and of omnivorous readers, any such book must of its kind be unique, and demand notice. Even dullness has its degrees of merit. "*Murder*," says a great writer, "may be regarded '*æsthetically*,' in relation to good taste. A *fire* may be good or bad; a *thief* rises through successive grades of excellence, until he culminates into what Aristotle calls *κλεπτήν τέλειον*; and an *ulcer* may be worthy of admiration as '*a beautiful ulcer*.'" Regarded in this light, therefore, TUPPER has a right to notice among the immortals. Had he been simply content to write himself down "*Anser*" among the multitude of other birds with long sibilant necks, outspread wings, and graceful steps, he would have escaped unnoticed; but when he soars to the very heavens, and lays claim to the fuller title of—to coin a word—"Anserimus," he becomes a spectacle at once

"To gods and men, and Paternoster Row."

Thousands are attracted at once by the grandeur of the flight, the fulness of the song, the beauty of the plumage, the breadth of wing, the longitude of neck. Then rises the question, "Is the noble bird after all a SWAN, thus to wing its way across the liquid domains of æther? Can claim, indeed, be laid to the poet's words—

"Digna sed argutos interstrepere anser olores?"

This is the question, of considerable interest, which we propose in some measure to solve, by the careful examination of a book that otherwise has no more claim on the notice of educated people than the crude effusions of a Clapham schoolboy, whose head has been turned by the praises of injudicious friends.

Mr. Tupper's reputation rests on *Proverbial Philosophy*, and to this we shall mainly confine our remarks, merely culling a few choice flowers from his other works at once to illustrate and adorn the critic's page. Before venturing, however, to say a word of our own, the author must himself speak in judgment of his own performances. "*CUIQUE SUUM*;" he surely must best understand his own writings. No sooner had he achieved his "*magnum opus*," *Proverbial Philosophy*, and it was fairly afloat, than he sent out (1838) a volume of poems, and among these two immortal fragments, entitled "*SONNET to my Book*," before publication, and "*To the Same*," after publication, which want of space alone prevents our printing in their complete beauty. In the first he apostrophizes *Proverbial Philosophy* as "*his soul's dear son, the image of his mind*," which he cannot send forth into the rude world without a blessing. But he fears the cold critic's jealous eye, "lest it may find, oh book,—

"In all thy purposed good little but ill;
May taunt thy simple garb as quaintly wrought,
And praise thee for no more than the *small skill*,
Of masquing as *thine own another's thought*."

This is Mr. Tupper's own deliberate judgment before sending forth "his soul's son" into this naughty world;

* 1. *Proverbial Philosophy*. By Martin F. Tupper. 104th thousand. 1861.

2. *Rides and Reveries of Æsop Smith*.

3. *Geraldine: a Sequel to Coleridge's Christabel*. By M. F. Tupper, M.A. 1838.

and we take it to be the most remarkable literary prophecy on record—remarkable, as being uttered by a father of his own progeny, and still more remarkable as being accurately and literally fulfilled. “The small skill of masquing as his own another’s thought” is precisely what we should say is his, neither more nor less. When the nuts are anything but worthless, the kernel belongs to somebody else; the husk, the shell, the outside trapping are his own. Yet, in spite of this fatal prescience on his part, and in spite of seeing his first prophecy in a measure fulfilled, he rushes into a second and equally successful vaticination, where he again says to the precious tome,—

“Child of my thoughts, my fancy’s favourite son,
On to the goal of honour, fair beginner;
A thousand ducats thou shalt yet be winner.”

This also has been fulfilled; the thousand ducats have been won, and other golden monies, so says report, with which we have no concern. But we have every right to concern ourselves with the question of *how* the ducats were won, and by what art the winner has managed to puff himself into the glories of a thirtieth edition.

We start, then, from his own description of his own skill, the power of masquing other people’s thoughts as his own. But unfortunately for him, though, as Shakespeare tells us, “every true man’s apparel fits your thief,” it by no means follows, as a wise critic says, that every true poet’s similitude or idea fits your plagiarist. Mr. Tupper has with unrivalled facility laid his hands on the common-places of ordinary thought, and of all ordinary wisecracks under the sun; and these well-known common-places he has bedizened out with an amount and variety of tawdry ornament that do him credit. No sooner does he find a grain of sense, or beauty, wisdom, or wit, than he sets up a portentous cackle on the fortunate discovery, and having dressed up the unfortunate bantling in new second-hand garments, loaded it with a dozen similitudes, illustrations, metaphors, and mysteries; having looked at it from behind, from before, and at both sides; having shown that what is true negatively is not true affirmatively, that two and two make four, and therefore do not make five; that five being one more than four, is *not* one less; he then, with a mixture of bathos, verbosity, and mock importance, calls upon mankind to draw near and hearken. That the garments are *not* new or becoming; that the similitudes, meant to lessen, only add to the perplexity and confusion; that the illustrations only surround the hapless sentiment or idea with a fresh cloud of words, and that new, frothy wine is least of all fitted to go into old bottles, never seems to enter into his mind. Image follows image, simile succeeds simile, truism is piled up on truism, greater and greater pressure is put on, more and more steam is got up,—until all at once, just as the reader fancies he has got hold of something, there is a sudden collapse; the bottle bursts, and in a gush of frothy eloquence the paragraph expires.

Before turning to the book of *Proverbial Philosophy*, we only pause for one moment to note that among his poems is one which he has the unparalleled audacity to call *Christabel*, as a conclusion to Coleridge’s exquisite fragment,—a poem in itself so wondrous, so perfect, that to imitate it was hopeless; to attempt its completion, to touch it with pen and ink, has been deemed sacrilege in the eyes of all lovers of poetry. Mr. Tupper, however, *has finished Christabel!* On the atrocity of the performance not a word need be said.

But now for examples from his great work; our only difficulty being to select, where every page teems with a profusion of beauties. We open, hap-hazard, at p. 138, in the middle of a chapter called “*Ridicule*.” He has been telling us that the laugh of a hooting world has in it a notion of sublimity; that tittering in private stingeth as a hive of wasps; that the hide of the rhinoceros is softer than the heart of deriding unbelief, and “truth is idler *there* than the bushman’s feathered reed;” that a droll conceit parrieth a thrust that should have hit the conscience, and the leering looks of humour tickle the childish mind; that “the matter of a man is mingled most with

folly, neither can he endure the gaze of wisdom;” that not one in a thousand has any idol but pleasure; that ridicule is weak against a strong mind, but men are cowards; and having, as it were, thus cleared the ground and prepared his readers, he breaks forth into the grand culminating truth,—

“Fear a nettle and touch it tenderly, its poison shall burn thee to the shoulder,

But, grasp it with a bold hand,—is it not a bundle of myrrh?”

This whole figure is a stolen one, and spoiled in the stealing. Fifty years ago a poet had written,—

“If you gently stroke a nettle,
Mark! it stings you for your pains;
Seize it like a man of metal,
And it soft as silk remains.”

This is poetry and good sense, founded on fact. Mr. Tupper’s is neither. If you touch a nettle tenderly, it does *not* burn you to the shoulder, but only in the fingers. And if you grasp it boldly, it is no more like myrrh than it is like asafetida. Moreover, myrrh is a rough, nauseous gum; not tied up in bundles at all; and its virtue lies in the healing of wounds, which in this case the nettle has never given. The whole passage, too, is equally full of false, illogical, imagery. The hide of the rhinoceros *may* be softer than the heart of unbelief—for the hard heart has been likened to a nether millstone; but to say that “truth is idler *there* than the bushman’s feathered reed,” is downright, absolute, sheer nonsense. It would have been equally well to say, “idler than the bullet of the minie rifle,” than “the hair-pin of the painted grisette,” or, “the cordial of the licensed victualler.” The bushman’s feathered reed is neither more nor less than a poisoned arrow. If used literally, it could never get into the heart of unbelief at all; if metaphorically, the passage is utterly and entirely devoid of meaning. Again, “wasps do not live in hives, nor does humour *leer*.” The images are false and unnatural, and the meaning they convey is unmeaning balderdash. But we will take our author in a loftier flight at p. 3, in a chapter entitled WORDS OF WISDOM. There are, perhaps, in all the book of *Job*, and in the words of Solomon, no grander passages than those which refer to WISDOM, its greatness, and its value, and the price to be set on it. Specially grand is that twenty-eighth chapter of *Job*, treating of Wisdom as the gift of God, and that sublime passage beginning, “*Where shall wisdom be found? and where is the place of understanding?*” It is too well known to need full quotation here, but not therefore is it safe from the intolerable trifling of Mr. Tupper. “*The depth saith, It is not in me; and the sea saith, It is not with me. It cannot be gotten for gold;—no mention shall be made of coral, or of pearls, for the price of wisdom is above rubies.*” Grand and noble words, which our author dilutes into the following impotent twaddle:—

“What *price* shall count their *worth*?
Perfect and much to be desired, and giving joy with riches,
No lovely thing on earth can picture all their beauty.
They be chance pearls flung among the rocks by the waters of oblivion,
Which diligence loveth to gather, and hang round the neck of memory.”

Having thus asked *price* to count the *worth* of wisdom, as a perfect thing giving joy with riches, which no lovely thing on earth can picture, he takes a dive into the ocean of truth, and there finds words of wisdom thrown up by the waves of oblivion to be hung round the neck of memory. This is so natural, so graceful,—and so entirely new a figure,—that we merely pause to observe that it is not *usual* for pearls to be flung up by waves, and that *memory* will find but little in the waters of *oblivion*; and then pass on to the next line where the pearls have become—

“White-wing’d seeds of happiness, wafted from the islands of the blessed,”

tended by thought in the kindly garden of the heart; and to the next lines, where they successively undergo transformation into—

"Sproutings of the harvest for eternity, bursting through the tilth of time,
The drops of crystal dew, which the wings of seraphs love to scatter,
When on some brighter Sabbath, their plumes quiver most with delight:"

and are then likened to—

"The fumes of hallow'd incense, that veil the throne of the Most High,
As the beaded bubbles that sparkle on the rim of immortality;
As wreaths of the rainbow spray, from the pure cataracts of truth."

Having thus shown us that the words of Wisdom are PEARLS, WHITE-WINGED SEEDS, SPROUTINGS, DROPS OF DEW, FUMES, BUBBLES, WREATHS, he out-Tupperizes TUPPER with a daring and insolent vulgarity on which only he could venture, and tells us that Wisdom's words—

"Are grains of the diamond sand, the radiant floor of heaven,
Rising in sunny dust behind the chariot of God!!!"

Any simile more worthless than this, more vicious in point of taste, more profane, and at the same time more absurd we cannot recall throughout all the realms of so-called religious poetry,—a tolerably wide domain. And yet this is the stuff which is received with rapture, and applauded to the very echo by thousands of persons who have crown-pieces to spend, who have been educated, yea, "finished" at the best "academies;" who have paid for *extras*, and gone through all the *ologies*, have had a smattering of French, a smattering of Latin, and of moral philosophy;—but who, strangely enough, can neither think nor reason for themselves. Still, is it true that the foot of folly rushes in where angels dare not tread,—and still are found the crowd of gaping, admiring noodles, weak intellects, and unformed minds, who are ready to fall down and worship the foolish audacity of this grand *panjandrum* in his newest and most imposing attitudes.

But MR. TUPPER cannot only be diffuse, not only "career," as he might himself remark, "over the broad acres of bathos, and the platitudes of *Little Pedlington*," not only bid us quaff the flowing bowl of Solomon and water, well diluted, and well spiced with all the choicest aroma *Tuppérieuse*; he can also present to us the concentrated morsels of his wisdom in epigrams of a single line. The mighty hammer which crushes a mountain of iron will also condescend to crack a hazel-nut. Discoursing of *compensation*, he ejaculates,—

"Madness hath imaginary bliss, and most men have no more."
Of *wisdom*, again, he cries,—

"Memory is not wisdom; idiots can rote volumes."
Of *writing*, that,—

"To read with profit is of care; but to write aptly is of practice."
All we can say of these precious "sparklings from the fountain of truth," these "dainty aphorisms of philosophic musing" is, with honest CASSIO,—

"Why, this is a more exquisite song than the other."

As is the whole book, so are the pages; as each page, so is every line; as each line, so is every word. What can be truer than that madness has the bliss of imagination—imagination in its wildest, most unbridled mood—imagination soaring above or defying all the limits of sense, decency, and reason; all the laws of beauty, congruity, love, and truth? Yet what can be false than to assert that most men have no other bliss but that of the raving madman? To the maniac the gift of imagination is no other than a bitter curse; to the rest of the world it is a divinest and choicest possession, a noblest gift of God. If it be true that nine-tenths of mankind have no joy but that of lunatic imagination,—

"Then all the world is mad, and earth itself a vast asylum,
Where crazy fools are born, and live, and die, and there's an end."

We commend this striking quotation to Mr. Tupper's special consideration, as a grand theme for a new volume of philosophy; and in the meanwhile we cordially agree with him that "memory is NOT wisdom;" of which his *magnum opus*, "the son of his soul," "the image of his mind," "the child of his thoughts," and "the favourite offspring of his fancy,"—is an unanswerable proof. Not only do we believe that "idiots can rote volumes," but we

begin to suspect that they can and do *write* them, and that they actually find purchasers. So much for Epigrams I. and II.; but what shall be said of No. III.?

"To read with profit is of care, but to write aptly is of practice?"

He who wishes to read with advantage must practice with care; but, on the other hand, he who wishes to write with advantage must be careful in his practice. Can it be *this*? Can so vast an amount of accumulated truth, and of light so brilliant, be all summed up in one briefest line? If so, then, we *must* say that this one line is worthy of our author in his happiest moments of inspiration. And, as for that wicked heresy of *Dogberry's* that—"To be a well-favoured man is the gift of fortune; but to write and read comes by nature,"—it must henceforth be banished from the lips of men. But the mystery of Mr. Tupper's utterances is one of their highest charms. Great writers must be mysterious, dark, and profound. This is a well-known truth; and he relies on it for producing some of his finest effects; e.g. having done with *reading* and *writing*, we naturally come to "*speaking*,"—and our first great fact is that—

"Speech is the golden harvest that followeth the flowering of thought."

Being, at the same time, "reason's brother;" that—

"Spirit may mingle with spirit, but sense requireth a symbol;
And speech is the body of a thought, without which it were not seen."

This, if we understand it aright, means that "SPEECH," being *reason's brother*,—(why not his *son*?) is the golden harvest of the flowers of *thought*, to which it is a *body*, that is to say, as we take it, the grain, the substantial truth on which a man may feed. The *thought* once uttered in living words *then*, and not till then, is turned from flower to fruit that men may gather. So far all is clear. But then comes another utterance of our oracle, which snatches away every gleam of light and wraps the whole question in profound mystery. Spoken words being, as we have seen, the precious harvest of grain,—to our utter dismay we suddenly find that words are after all but *stubble* when the harvest is done. We are told to—

"Reap the ideas and house them well; but leave the words' high stubble:
Strive to store up what was thought, despising what was said."

That is to say, store up the flowers; but despise the grain. But, if speech be the *golden harvest*, how can it at the same time be *stubble*? If we are to store up the thoughts, i.e. the *flowers* out of which the grain springs,—what becomes of the harvest? How can we despise "what is said," if speech be the precious grain in which all the nourishment is shrined? If speech be nothing better than *stubble*,—what becomes of his brother Reason? Is he, too, doomed to become as chaff?

But, turn where we will throughout this book, judge it by paragraphs, or by single lines, and we find the same mixture of poor, common-place, truisms; the same affectation of mystery; crowding of words, multitude of tawdry ornament, and utter confusion of ideas. Why, to understand what "LIFE" is, should we be told (1), that it is "the current spark on the miner's wheel of flints;" (2), "a morsel of frankincense burning in the halls of eternity;" and (3), that it is "a lump of salt melting in the temple-laver?"

Why should we be told that "'BOOKS' are groves of knowledge, where all may eat, nor fear a flaming sword," "proofs and results of immortality;" or that to be without them is "to live as an Esquimaux in lethargy; to die as a Mohawk in ignorance." (?) It is obvious, at a glance, that if human life be like a lump of salt, we gain nothing by being told it is like a morsel of frankincense, or a current spark. And, if books are in any sense groves of knowledge where all may eat, they are most certain to yield to all fools, knaves, and cowards the very flame which Mr. Tupper here denies; while there is no reason whatever why an Esquimaux should be less ignorant or

more lethargic than a Mohawk. For this lavish use of false and foolish similes Mr. Tupper offers excuse, which we give in his own potent words:—

“Moreover, for this filagree of fancy, this oriental garnish of similitude,—

Alas, the world is old—and all things old within it;
I walk a good old path, I love the good old ways.
Truth, in a garment of the past, is my choice and simple theme;
No truth is new to-day; and the mantle was another's.”

For his infinite confusion of thought, the vague variety of topics introduced under titles with which they have no possible connection, “for his facts, comparisons, and meditative atoms, gathered on the heap of combination, mingled in speech with the gossamer dreams of reverie” (p. 190), he has no more to say than this:—

“He spreads his net for a draught, and takes the glittering shoal;
Chasing no solitary stag, tracking it with breathless toil,
He hunts with Aureng-zebe, and spears surrounded thousands.”

Not that this lofty pursuit and noble game are a boast to him; “sweet charity, think otherwise;” he exclaims:—

“For the dog-fish and poisonous ray are captured in the mullet-haul,
The crane and the kite are of my thoughts alike with the partridge
and the quail;
And unclean meats, as of the clean, hang upon my *Seric* shambles.”

This, our last quotation, would alone suffice to prove the tone, quality, and scope of the whole book, and the truth of our assertion that the substance of *Proverbial Philosophy* is made up of common-place truisms, an abundance of affected, false imagery, unreal sentiment, and tawdry ornament. The author has the small skill, as he suspects, of *masquing* other people's thoughts, and of dressing them up in a motley garb of pretentious words, with an air of mock philosophy; but he has nothing whatever to say which has not already been far better said. His books are welcomed and are read by persons who are just beginning to think for themselves, and have but a slender acquaintance with men or books; by those of small tastes, and small passions, or of mild intellect, who enjoy having these littlenesses feebly stimulated, and here find just what they want. They have an itching desire to be wise without the toil of learning; to dip into questions of quasi-philosophical moralizing; to dabble with such words as “concrete and abstract” and “bidden uses;” to unlock the doors of small mysteries, especially the little mystery within them. To all such as these Mr. Tupper is a perfect god-send. To them he calls in loftiest and most oracular tones, “I am the very teacher ye need; *e cælo descendit γνῶσις σωτῆρος*. Therefore, in the name of the prophet, *FIGS!*”

Theories of the Propagation of Mankind.—Traducianism and Creatianism.*

IN a previous number we entered upon a careful examination of the Scripture History of Creation, with the view of discovering what light it threw upon the threefold nature of man. We found reason to conclude that, while body, soul, and spirit are three distinct existences, the soul is dependent upon the spirit, derives its life from it, and has no existence apart from it. We remarked too, that, whereas the body was formed from the dust of the ground, the higher parts of our nature were produced by the impartation of a “spirit of life,” from God. Now, supposing that we accept this account of the creation of the first man, it is obvious that we gain from it no information as to the manner in which each man now comes into being. We believe that the creation of Adam was, in a sense, the creation of the human race; but we naturally want to know how the race is derived from Adam, how it has

been propagated since the creation of the first man. Do we, the children of Adam, derive from him our first parent, and from our intermediate progenitors, our body, soul, and spirit? or do we receive only our body from our parents, while our spirit is imparted by the direct agency of the Creator?

Various theories have been promulgated in answer to this question. According to one, the theory of Origen, every human being who comes into the world is the incarnation of a spirit which sinned in a previous state of existence. According to a second, commonly known by the name of *Creatianism*, our bodies only are propagated by our parents, while the spiritual part is conveyed to the body by the immediate creative act of the Most High. According to a third, known as *Traducianism*, our whole nature of body, soul, and spirit is derived from our parents, not, of course, without the operation of Divine power, but with that power acting mediately, and not immediately.

These questions have long occupied the minds of the most profound psychologists and theologians; and, hitherto, without leading to any generally received conclusion. It may be that we are not in a position to come to a decision, or that there is something defective in our statement of the question. In fact, it will be found here, as in most other cases, that the most serious objections on both sides are brought against the view of the doctrine in the objector's mind, rather than that which is held by its defender. It must not be imagined, however, because this uncertainty prevails, that these subjects are to be classed among the “questions and strifes of words,” which S. Paul cautions Timothy against in his First Epistle, or among the “vain babblings” which he condemns in the Second. It has been clearly seen by the deepest thinkers that these questions stand in close connection with the most important and fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, such as the *Incarnation* and *Original Sin*. We need only refer to the use made of them by Pelagius, with reference to the latter doctrine, and by Wilberforce, in our own times, with reference to the former.

Before the appearance of the Redeemer on earth, the Creatian theory was the more commonly entertained, unless by those who had imbibed the opinions of the Platonic and cognate philosophies. The Platonist theory of knowledge presupposed the existence of the soul of man in a previous state; and such was the doctrine promulgated by Origen, whose theory was condemned by the fifth general Council, the second of Constantinople. The most common view in the Christian Church, up to the time of Augustine, was in favour of Creatianism, with the remarkable exception of Tertullian. In the well-known treatise of this great writer, *De Animâ*, he taught that “the soul of the first man was the source of all other souls which were developed in the continuation of the race, and that the soul of the first man was propagated along with the body, the so-called *propagatio animarum per traducem*, Traducianism.”* It must be noted here that Tertullian, in common with most of the writers of the Western Church, held the dichotomy of human nature, including in the word *soul*, as they had undoubted scriptural grounds for doing, both soul and spirit.

It is necessary to point out this, and to understand clearly that Tertullian's Traducianism applies to the whole of man's nature, because the Traducianism advocated in Wilberforce's work on the *Incarnation* is quite different from this, so different indeed that it exactly corresponds with the theory which a recent German writer describes as a form of Creatianism! On this point, as on so many others, he simply follows Aquinas, without appearing to be aware of any other form of the doctrine which he professes to advocate, and teaches that, while the soul as well as the body, is transmitted from parent to child, the spirit or *anima intellectiva* of Aquinas is imparted by the immediate creative act of God. S. Jerome's conclusion in favour of Creatianism was drawn from premises which were clearly seen to be insufficient by S. Augustine; and

* Delitzsch's *Biblische Psychologie*. Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*. Neander's *Antignosticus*. Flavel's *Pneumatologia*. Wilberforce on the *Incarnation*. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1862, Pt. 3, &c.

* Neander: *Antignosticus*, which see for references.

yet this great father declined to express an opinion on the subject. It has been remarked by most writers* who have treated these questions, as a striking proof of the candour and truthfulness of one who, of all uncanonical writers, has exercised the greatest influence in the Western Church, that, although Traducianism was favourable to his doctrine of original sin, he hesitated to express his approval of it, because, as he said himself, "where holy Scripture does not express itself clearly on a subject, human presumption must be checked."† From the time of S. Augustine, amid differences of opinion, the tendency was for the most part towards Creatianism up to the Reformation. P. Lombard distinctly holds it. Aquinas defends a modified Traducianism.‡ Since the Reformation, the divines of the Roman communion, in logical accordance with their Pelagian tendencies, have mostly been Creatianists, while the Lutheran writers have chiefly held to Traducianism. Our surprise at finding an acute and logical reasoner like Calvin on the side of Creatianism, a surprise which is natural enough when we consider his emphatic assertion of the total corruption of our race, will be lessened when we remember his strong predestinarian tendencies, and the small scope which he allows to the human will. Since writing this sentence, we have met with a remark in his *Institutes* which abundantly confirms our suggestion. When pressed by the difficulty, which must ever beset the advocate of Creatianism, of the transmission of sin, he replies, that the contagion does not arise from the substance either of the flesh or of the soul, but because it was so ordained by God!§

Without affirming that we can arrive at a conclusion which shall be free from all uncertainty, we have no hesitation in deciding in favour of Traducianism. In stating our reasons for doing so, we shall also endeavour faithfully to note the objections which have been brought against it, and the arguments by which it has been attempted to support the opposite theory of Creatianism.

With respect to the theory that all men existed in a previous state of being, it would scarcely be necessary even to notice it here, had it not recently found a defender in Dr. Julius Müller, who brings it forward in his work on the *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, to explain the universal prevalence of moral evil among men. The texts which are commonly adduced from the sacred Scriptures are utterly insufficient to lend the least probability to a theory so wild, as most persons will feel when they hear that the principal passages are, Ecclesiastes xii. 7, Jeremiah i. 5, and Romans ix. 11-13. But if Scripture contains nothing which can be quoted in support of it, neither consciousness nor reasonable probability will be found to sustain it. Dim reminiscences of scenes half-forgotten do unquestionably rise up in the mind and suggest a past connection with persons and places which are now gone for ever; but these remembrances may frequently be referred to our actual experience in this world; and even when that is not the case, are so vague as to be, with equal probability, the basis of a thousand other theories equally visionary and unreal.

The theory of *Creatianism* deserves a more respectful treatment at our hands, inasmuch as it has been held by men of the greatest eminence, and has arguments of no light weight on its side. Let us, before endeavouring to meet those arguments, clearly understand the difference between these rival theories. It is not that the propagation of the spirit is attributed by the one theory to God, and by the other to man. It may suit the purposes of the controversialist to state the question in that form, but such a representation is thoroughly unfair. The question is, whether, as Creatianism teaches, God creates the spirit *im-*

mediately, and by a direct act of will unites it to the body, which is generated by the parents; or whether, as Traducianism teaches, He creates the spirit as well as the body mediately and indirectly through the parents. Let us first hear the arguments of the Creatianist.

The principal objection to the theory of Traducianism, as might naturally be expected, is the notion that it is of necessity materialistic in its tendency, an objection which, in various forms, has been constantly reiterated by the defenders of Creatianism. It is granted freely that the law of Traducianism may hold with respect to the lower forms of animated existence, but it is supposed that such a theory must detract from the dignity of the rational creature, man. "It is impossible," says Aquinas,* "that the active virtue which is in matter should extend its action, so as to produce an immaterial effect." To the same purpose, although with a different point of view, it is remarked by Flavel (*Pneumatologia*), that "that which is generable is also corruptible: but the spiritual immortal soul is not subject to corruption. Nor is it imaginable how a soul should be produced out of matter, which is not endued with reason, or how a bodily substance can impart that to another which it has not in itself." There is much in these remarks, which, it will be observed, are some of them the very echo of the words of Aquinas, which undoubtedly commends itself to our common popular notions. But, if it be remembered how impenetrable is the mystery in which the whole subject of the reproduction of animal life is involved, we shall hesitate before we admit the conclusiveness of this reasoning. In what difficulties are we involved at once if we assume its accuracy! It supposes that matter may reproduce matter, but what does it say of the whole mystery of life and organization? Is it not one of the clearest principles of physiology that life causes organization and is not caused by it? Whence, then, the principle of life which is the organizing force in the generated offspring? Aquinas admits the doctrine of Traducianism to apply to the *anima nutritiva* and the *anima sensitiva*, but not to the *anima intellectiva*. Granting that the difficulty may be greater in the last case, we affirm that the argument which is held to be conclusive on the Creatianist side, so far as the *spirit* or *rational soul* is concerned, must be admitted as destroying Traducianism in any of its forms.

It seems to have been overlooked by those who have made use of this argument, that the theory of Traducianism does not exclude the Divine agency. It fully admits a Divine creative energy in the production of every human being, body and soul, as well as spirit; but it asserts that such energy is put forth in a certain orderly way, that God has appointed that every successive production of a human being shall be brought about by the instrumentality of human agents. When, therefore, it is asserted by the advocates of Creatianism that the opposite theory excludes the providential element in human history, as is done by Fichte, and that it makes man the mere creature of nature, as is asserted by Lange, it is forgotten that we ascribe what are called the works of nature to the providence, and the sustaining creative power of God, no less than the higher parts of His great kingdom. When S. Jerome quoted the text, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," as destructive of Traducianism, he was opposing that theory only as it existed in his own mind. God does work without ceasing; but in different ways. Creation, in the full signification of that word, was completed at the end of the sixth day, but in a secondary sense of the word, every new production is an act of creation. God is equally the author of man's flesh and of man's spirit. In the two cases we have the production of *different things*; but there is no need to assume a *special kind* of creation to account for the production of spirit. And this is the proper answer to the argument derived from texts of Scripture. When we read, "The spirit shall return to God who gave it," there may be a reference to the first act of creation, which is rendered probable by the earlier part of the verse: "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was;" or it

* See Wilberforce, *Incarn.* c. 3; cf. Neander and Delitzsch.

† De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, 2. 59. The same opinion is expressed in his *Retractationes*, i. 1. 3: "Quod attinet ad animæ originem, utrum de illo uno sit, qui primum creatus est, quando factus est homo in animam vivam, an similiter ita fiant singulis singuli; nec tunc sciebam, nec adhuc scio."

‡ P. Lombard: *Sent.* 2. 17. Aquinas: *Summa* i. Q. 118.

§ "Neque in substantiâ carnis aut animæ causam habet contagio; sed quia a Deo ita fuit ordinatum."—*Inst.* ii. 1. 7.

* *Sum. Theol.* i. Q. 118. Art. 2.

is susceptible of the simple and fair interpretation, that the spirit, like every good and perfect gift, is from above. If again, it is said that God is called "the Father of spirits," we shall require to have it shown that there is a contrast intended between our bodies and our spirits as being produced the one by man, the other by God, which cannot be done; for first, God is not here spoken of as the Father of *our* spirits, but "*of (sc. all) spirits,*" and besides, the opposition between flesh and spirit in the New Testament is too well known, in a widely different sense, to permit of our resting an argument on a passage the interpretation of which is necessarily so doubtful. Let it be remembered, moreover, that whichever theory we adopt, God is peculiarly the author of the spirit, inasmuch as He imparted that to the lifeless body by breathing into man's nostrils "the breath of life."

In adopting the theory of Traducianism, as having the greater probability and weight of evidence on its side, we fully admit the absence of positive proof, and we feel that the day may come when the whole question shall be stated in a form which shall go far to reconcile the two sides. As we have put it, we have endeavoured to do justice to the element of truth in Creatianism, while holding firmly the substantial truth of Traducianism. And by this we do not mean the theory which is so called by Wilberforce, nor the similar one which is advocated by Aquinas. Such a tearing of soul and spirit asunder would be incompatible with the view given in our previous article of the connection between them, and, as we believe, also inconsistent with the Scripture history of creation. By *Traducianism*, or, as some have termed it, *Generationism*, we understand that the whole of man's threefold nature of body, soul, and spirit is by God's appointment propagated by the parents. It will be obvious, from the remarks already made on the texts adduced in support of Creatianism, that the proof of either theory is not to be derived from isolated sentences of holy Scripture, but rather from the facts which it records and the doctrines which it reveals respecting the nature of man and the work of redemption. We do not, therefore, lay great stress upon words such as are met with in Genesis xlvii. 26, and Acts xvii. 26, although they are at least as favourable to the one side as those already noticed appear to be to the other.

1. Our first argument for Traducianism is drawn from the *history of creation*. It is stated, in the beginning of the sacred narrative, that the whole work of creation was completed in the six days, and that God rested on the seventh. We do not, of course, understand the rest of the Sabbath to indicate the entire withdrawal of the God of providence from the work of His hands; but we do believe it to mean that the work which He carried on afterwards was of a different kind from that which He had performed in the week of creation. Every living creature which He had formed He had endowed with the power of reproduction; and henceforth the successive individuals of the various classes which He had called into being were to come into existence by means of those which were already made. Nor have we any reason to exempt man from the general, the universal law. The assertion of Mr. Hallam,* that "man's nature, as it now is, that which each man and all men possess, is the immediate workmanship of God, as much as at his creation,"—this statement, we say, is quite unfounded, if it is intended to exclude the co-operation of the parents. It is true that every human being who now comes into the world is as much the creature of God as was Adam. The co-operation of Divine providence cannot be too much insisted upon with respect to every work of man's. But this proposition is widely different from that which attributes the immediate production of the human soul and spirit to the Creator. The Bible does not indeed *assert* that henceforth the creative work of God was mediate and indirect, instead of being direct and immediate as it was at first: but this is clearly implied in the statement that God rested from His work, His work which was "finished from the foundation of the world." (Heb. iv. 3.) If we consider, moreover, the terms in

* Quoted by Wilberforce.

which the further propagation of the race is set forth, we shall be struck with the difference between that and the first creation. The creation of the human race in Adam may be said to receive its strongest verification, so far as the evidence of the Old Testament is concerned, from the account of the formation of Eve. There was no separate creation. She was formed of a rib taken from the side of man. Nor do we read, as we might expect had the case been so, that God breathed into her nostrils the breath of life. We are left to assume that the whole of her threefold nature was derived from Adam.

2. The theory of Traducianism renders the development and connection of the human race more intelligible. It is difficult to see how the unity of the race can be maintained on the other principle. The body of man is not human nature, nor can the propagation of the body by human generation form a real bond of union between the successive units of which the race is made up. It is our *personality* which constitutes our true manhood; it is this which separates us from the inferior creation. But we have shown, if indeed it needed to be shown, that personality is an attribute of spirit. According to Creatianism, therefore, we are to regard the race of man as a series of beings, whose very essence is in each case of independent existence, and who are therefore united to each other by no other bond than that of material derivation and spiritual resemblance. Let the students of the philosophy of history say whether such a theory is compatible with the results of their investigations.

3. But, further, the transmission of intellectual and moral qualities from father to son demands the Traducian theory to account for it. We could quite account for bodily resemblances on the other supposition; but what should we then say of those which are intellectual and moral? The least observant of men can hardly have failed to remark these qualities of the parent reappearing in the child. It is not denied that temperament has much to do with mental resemblances; but who will venture to say that temperament is wholly the cause of such? If we knew more of the relation between body and mind, might we not learn that it was rather the effect? But, apart from any weight which such a suggestion may possess, it will be felt by most candid and thoughtful inquirers, that the striking resemblances between father and son are utterly unaccountable on the Creatian theory, while they receive a natural explanation from the Traducian. It was inevitable that Pelagius and his followers, who denied the doctrine of original sin, and held to the native purity of every son of man, should deny the law of the transmission of the spirit from the parents. If the remark of Hallam already quoted were true, his inference would be undeniable. "The corruption of human nature" he declares to be an expression which is "analogical and inexact." Most unquestionably it is on his theory. If every human soul be the immediate creation of Almighty God, then it must come into existence as pure as the soul of the first man. The misfortune is, that such a statement is directly contradicted by the facts. If the tree be good, it is unaccountable that its fruit should be universally bad. We must not forget, however, that the theory which we are opposing has been defended not merely by its natural sponsors, Pelagians and Socinians, but even by those whom we should have supposed to be its natural enemies, Calvin and his followers. We have already quoted the words of the great Necessitarian—we had almost said Fatalist; nor can we reflect upon them without a shudder, when we perceive the iron bondage which such a system would impose. It is, however, most instructive to mark the shifts to which more recent teachers of his doctrines have been driven, in order to reconcile their theology and psychology. Flavel's remarks on the objection to Creatianism, that the soul of man is impure, are those which have most commonly received the *imprimatur* of his school. The soul is created, he says, "neither morally pure nor impure." We should like very much to know what that can be. But, he says, it is "impure and tainted as soon as united, for the union constitutes a child of Adam, and consequently a sinful im-

pure creature." A marvellous explanation, truly! Rather, let us say, a clever piece of legerdemain. Man is created not impure, he says; but this was the fact questioned. "The child of Adam is impure," he adds; but this was the difficulty which he had to overcome. The only help which he deigns to afford is this, that the union constitutes the impurity. So far as we are able to see, and no argument adduced on the side of Creatianism has yet removed the difficulty, we might as well say that the moral purity of an angel was injured by his coming into contact with mud. The objection, however, is stated in another form in the same work: "How came they then to be defiled and tainted with original sin?" And the answer is: "What if this be one of those mysteries reserved for the world to come, &c.!" A reply which might be quite satisfactory were we merely endeavouring to reconcile two doctrines revealed in the Scriptures, but which must be dismissed at once, and, we may add, with indignation, when it is brought forward as a plea for a theory which is certainly human, and which we regard as more than probably erroneous. We may not, indeed, say that the doctrines of original sin, and of the headship of Adam, are bound up indissolubly with the doctrine of Traducianism; but it will be apparent that they are most consistent with this theory.

4. The present article has already extended to a greater length than was intended, or it might have been shown that our view of the subject now under consideration must greatly affect our understanding of the doctrine of the Incarnation. How the mere derivation of His body from His human mother could have constituted our Blessed Lord the "Son of man," we cannot profess to understand, or how such a theory is to be reconciled with the statement that He is "man, of the substance of His mother." But especially do we find it hard to understand how the theory of Creatianism can be held along with the teaching of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and the fifteenth of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. We regret that we cannot point to any noteworthy attempt at a solution of these questions in the works of our great English theologians. Few of them have even referred to them; and the present day has not as yet supplied the defect. We have able Biblical critics, and we have great theologians; but we have few psychologists, and we have no name of eminence connected with the subject of Biblical psychology.

The points upon which we have offered the foregoing necessarily brief and imperfect remarks are not only deeply interesting as objects of speculation, but have the closest connection with doctrines of infinite importance. The contest between Pelagianism, in all its various modifications, and Catholic, that is, Scriptural Truth, goes on from age to age, and, more than any other difference, lies at the root of our schisms and dissensions. If the strife is ever to cease, such happy consummation must be brought about, not only through a more perfect acquaintance with the Word of God, but also by means of that which is most clearly connected with it, a more full and accurate knowledge of the nature of man.

Ecclesia Vindicata.*



HIS is an admirable and well-printed little book on a question of the utmost importance to the due relations of Church and State. We do not know any publication of an important kind so accurate in research, so moderate and comprehensive in its suggestions, and so readable in style and form as this very seasonable little summary. In the compass of 220 duodecimo pages, on good paper, and in excellent type, Mr. Wayland Joyce puts his reader in easy possession of a case which is far from creditable to our modern lawmakers, and is continually producing the grossest injustice to individuals, as well as surely undermining the National Church.

* *Ecclesia Vindicata: a Treatise on Appeals in Matters Spiritual.* By James Wayland Joyce, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, &c., &c. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1862.

The public mind is not at present so agitated upon the subject as at that melancholy era when the Gorham judgment embarrassed the highest Courts of the realm, and convulsed the Church with the protests of bishops and clergy, followed by a deplorable disturbance of the national faith. Yet even at this moment some of the deepest points of doctrine are under litigation in the Ecclesiastical Court, and individuals are prosecuting and defending suits at a ruinous expense to themselves, with the most doubtful prospects of a satisfactory adjudication. The cost, delay, and uncertainty of ecclesiastical proceedings are the standing reproach of our age. In the case of the notorious *Essays and Reviews* the Bishops of both provinces have indeed declared their unanimous condemnation; but they have done this in an irregular and unauthoritative manner, and have thereby destroyed all the value of their united act. The authors of teaching pronounced by *all the Bishops* to be subversive of the Christian faith, continue to hold their benefices unchallenged, save by the courage and self-sacrifice of the Bishop of Salisbury and the Rev. Mr. Fendall.

There are actually no less than *four* independent tribunals at which a clergyman may be impeached for heretical doctrine; and no one of them is competent to pronounce a judgment which shall secure even a *minimum* of public confidence. 1. Under the Church Discipline Act the charge may be decided by a Commission *ad hoc*, appointed by the bishop, and composed of any persons, priests, lawyers, magistrates, or common laymen, at his pleasure. 2. In a suit of *duplex querela* the case is decided by the Ecclesiastical Judge, commonly a lay Doctor of Civil Law. 3. In the writ of *quare impedit* the Court of Queen's Bench refers the question to the metropolitan and is bound by his single certificate. Lastly, the clerk may be convened under the Statute of Elizabeth, before the bishop in person, (or if his living be in the bishop's patronage, before the archbishop,) and be deprived on his private opinion.

Of these four forms of proceeding we have actually had examples in the last ten or twelve years; and we are not sure that some further instruments of torture might not be evoked out of our various legislative and canonical enactments. Meantime all these tribunals are expressly precluded from hearing and determining the true issue. The only Court that can pronounce on *heresy* is Convocation, and its judgments are expressly required to be based on canonical Scripture, and the Decrees of the Four General Councils. The other tribunals are limited to the interpretation of particular documents; they invariably and even ostentatiously exclude all reference to the Bible, which our Sixth Article declares to be alone required of any man as an Article of the Faith!

Now all this confusion, though perpetually cast in the teeth of the Church, is entirely the work of Parliament: and so unjustly has Parliament acted (under Whig influence) to the Church, that when a few years ago the laity would no longer tolerate the burden, in questions affecting their own affairs, instead of reforming the Ecclesiastical judicature, the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction was transferred (at great cost) to a new court; and the clergy were left under the old odious yoke, rendered heavier by the abstraction of the causes which alone provided the pecuniary means of sustaining a Bar and a Court of the requisite learning.

Mr. Joyce shows us that the greater part of the evils we complain of are the work of the present generation. The Judicial Committee, established in 1833, (3 & 4 William IV. c. 41.) and the Clergy Discipline Act of 1840, (3 & 4 Vict. c. 86.), are the sources of most of the mischief: and notably in the *Courts of Final Appeal*, created, or left in operation, by those enactments. It is to the latter point (undoubtedly the most urgent) that this valuable publication is principally addressed. As the law now stands Mr. Joyce enumerates *three* Courts of Final Appeal which may pronounce irrevocably on a clergyman's doctrine:—

1. First, the Upper House of Convocation, in cases touching the king. This was enacted by the 24 Henry

VIII. c. 12, which he believes to be still unrepealed: but in the Gorham case it was ruled by all the Common Law judges that this Statute was repealed by the 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.

The other two tribunals are in regular operation. They consist of a Committee of Privy Council differently constituted according to the court in which the suit was commenced. In a case of *duplex querela* (the form in Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter) the judicial committee is composed exclusively of lay persons, and principally lawyers. It includes the Privy Councillors holding or having held the offices of Lord Chancellor or Keeper, Master of the Rolls, Chief Justice or Chief Baron, Judge of the Prerogative Court, and Judge of the High Court of Admiralty. We omit the Vice Chancellor of England and the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy (!) because we believe those offices are no longer in existence. With these are conjoined the Lord President (with any *ex-President*), and two other Privy Councillors may be appointed by sign manual. These are in effect the "law lords" of the Privy Council, and with them, or the majority of such as may happen to attend, is entrusted the final determination of the points of faith arising in the cause before them. They are not required or empowered to refer to any spiritual authority as the Court of Queen's Bench does to the metropolitan in the suit of *quare impedit*. They cannot direct an issue to be tried in the Ecclesiastical Court, as this very tribunal is empowered to do in a court of common law. They do not take evidence of the law of the Church from competent witnesses, as all our courts do with respect to French, Scottish, or other foreign law. They hear and determine the point themselves in the plenitude of the theological knowledge inherent in a Privy Councillor. It is not necessary to be even a nominal Churchman. All the offices named except the Lord Chancellor (and his attendance is not requisite) may be held by Papists or Dissenters. Lord Brougham thinks that no such law lord ought to sit on such a cause; but the law empowers him to sit, and Mr. Joyce justly observes:—

"There is some risk of such a state of things occurring, when a Privy Councillor has thought it consistent with his duty to enrol himself as a member of the 'Liberation Society,' an institution chiefly remarkable for its bitter animosity, and untiring hostility to the Church of England." (P. 108).

In the Gorham case an attempt was made to impart an ecclesiastical appearance to this lay tribunal by calling in the two archbishops and the Bishop of London. The last-mentioned learned prelate repudiated the decision arrived at; but if both the archbishops had concurred in his objection, the judgment must have stood all the same. The prelates were not members of the tribunal, and had no voice in the decision. They were not present, like Judges in the House of Lords, to declare the law as held by the bishops. They did not even "certify" to the doctrine, as the Archbishop of Canterbury afterwards did to the Court of Queen's Bench. They were not cross-examined as they might have been in the witness box. They were simply three divines invested with no authority, two of whom signified a private approval, and one a private dissent, to a judgment which the members of the court were obliged to pronounce by the responsibility of their oaths whether the bishops liked it or no.

Mr. Joyce concurs in the view promulgated by Lord Brougham, that this exclusively lay tribunal was not intended to try questions of that nature, that it was designed to hear colonial and admiralty appeals, and the faith of the Church was shovelled in *per incuriam* under some general terms at the end of the act. We observe, however, that Ecclesiastical appeals are mentioned in the *preamble* of the act; but for which it might be possible to contend they were not included in its purview—that all other modes of appeal are abolished; and though Mr. Joyce confidently thinks the Church was "overlooked" when the framer of the bill came to its enacting clauses, it is quite as possible that this was an early specimen of the "unostentatious" sleight-of-hand with which we have since become better acquainted.

In the Church Discipline Act of 1840 an attempt was made to remedy the mistake by what Mr. Joyce very

properly designates as "a clumsy expedient." It was provided that on all appeals arising under that act the Judicial Committee should include, in addition to its other members, all such archbishops and bishops as are Privy Councillors, and that no appeal shall be heard unless one of them be present. Practically these spiritual Councillors are three, reduced to two by the necessary withdrawal of the archbishop whose judgment is appealed against. In Mr. Poole's case the disqualification extended to the Bishop of London also; and the see of York becoming vacant, the Bishop of Durham, its intended occupant, was sworn of the Council to get on with the work. More slovenly legislation it is impossible to imagine. One bishop, hearing the arguments of counsel among an indefinite number of lay and legal judges, is as much out of his element as the unhappy peer one occasionally sees lounging in the House of Lords while the "law lords" are trying an appeal. At best he has only a single voice in the decision: a voice easily overruled by the confident *dicta* of the legal members with respect to the force of the argument (which they take care to confine within their own limits), and which only serves to fasten a little more personal responsibility on the prelate without in any way eliciting the judgment of the Church. We agree with Mr. Joyce that such a fictitious ecclesiastical character is worse than a purely lay tribunal.

"The association of ecclesiastical members with a Civil Court on the one hand, or the association of lay members with an Ecclesiastical Court on the other, are but clumsy and most unsatisfactory expedients, neither warranted by primitive practice, nor supported by any worthy example, nor consistent with ecclesiastical propriety, nor calculated to produce harmonious results. From such connections there cannot but be generated a hybrid and ill-favoured progeny, which it must be said the records of our past history do not commend at all hopefully for adoption. In such a tribunal the legal and theological mind would consort but ill together. Questions of law unfamiliar to the one, and of doctrine unfamiliar to the other, might lead to some very complicated perplexities touching the subject-matter, on which both in common would be exercised and confused. Moreover, with all due regard to the mental powers and attainments of my own order, one is not quite sure that the long practice in judicial investigations, and the polished acuteness and subtle perspicacity of those with whom ecclesiastics would be associated in such a court might not secure an overbalance in the scale against them, and obtain undue preponderance in turning a final judgment. And it is also quite likely that those divines to whom such a scheme might commend itself would not be the last to find themselves hopelessly prostrate in the stronger grasp of their more powerful associates. There is a still graver objection, however, to such a mixed Final Appeal Court. From the presence of ecclesiastics it would have at least the semblance of authority to define faith and doctrine. Now such a function can never be permitted to belong to any court whatsoever, by any man who understands and honours the original constitution of the Church, or of that branch of it now existing in these realms. Synods alone have the power of defining doctrine, and to grant even a semblance of such a power to any other authority whatsoever would be a most unwarrantable and most mischievous course."—(Pp. 171-173.)

Mr. Joyce concedes too much when he consents to view this question as a controversy between the Church and the State. To our mind it is a question of the integrity of Church and State against the innovations of the lawyers. Church and State, as defined in the *Statute of Supremacy*, means the union of the spirituality and temporality in obedience to the Crown: the body spiritual to declare the law Divine, and the judges and ministers of the other part to declare the law temporal. The Constitution recognizes the High Court of Parliament as the Supreme tribunal in temporal matters, and the Court of Convocation as the highest Ecclesiastical Court. (*Co. 4, Inst. 322, Godolph. Abridg.*) It is a mistake to regard either as a legislative assembly only; they are courts both of appeal and in the first instance. The most solemn trials of temporal crimes are by impeachment in Parliament: and the only court legally authorized to try heresy is Convocation. Sir Edward Coke says, "An heretic may be convicted before the Archbishop and other the clergy at a general Synod or Convocation, as it appeareth by our books and by our history." (*Co. 3, Inst. 39.*) Sir Matthew Hale lays it down that "Convocation is by the Common Law, the tribunal for pronouncing judgment on heretical opinions." (*Sum. P. C. 5.*) Such is the Constitution and the Common Law of the land. For years it has been inno-

vated upon by lawyers anxious to draw all fish into their own net. Their method is to claim all *interpretation* to themselves. For a long time they ruled supreme over the temporality in trials for treason and libel, by claiming as judges to decide on the law, leaving the fact only to the jury. They have since established in the House of Lords a power as law-lords in cases of appeal which the whole peerage would resist in an impeachment. The Judicial Committee is a device of the same nature to oust the sovereignty of the jurisdiction previously vested in the "King in Chancery," and the "King in Council." Those tribunals were confessedly inadequate, but there was no more reason (except on the principle of "nothing like leather") to replace them by lawyers than by divines. The Royal Supremacy would have been preserved in the one case as well as in the other. The judgment was in any case the Crown's: the question was how to provide the Crown with the most competent advisers. On many points this duty would be best discharged by lawyers, on some it can only be properly done by divines. This is admitted by the lawyers themselves. Lord Brougham tells the House of Lords that, "in some cases, he required the aid of a spiritual body in forming his judgment." Yet in the confession he betrays the *animus* we have to contend with. It must still be *his* judgment, not the Crown's, nor the Church's, but the *lawyers'*. Their incompetency to form one is well exposed by the late Bishop of London:—

"There are many grave questions in Theology, and those the most likely to come under the consideration of the Judicial Committee, which scarcely ever engage the attention of the laity, especially of those whose time is otherwise taken up, and whose profession necessarily leads their minds to other subjects. It is easy to conceive a case submitted to the decision of the Court in which the subject-matters would be altogether new to the members, and very hardly to be understood by them in the absence of previous study and thought. The terminology itself might be puzzling, and they might hardly comprehend the exact meaning of such expressions as, to persons versed in Theology, would appear the mere alphabet of the science. It must be said that, under such circumstances, the members of the Court would be quite incompetent to decide satisfactorily questions involving, perhaps, in their consequences the peace and unity of the Church, when all their previous studies had lain in an entirely different direction, and when their minds had been prepared by the habitual consideration of such matters to take an exact and comprehensive view of the case before them in all its bearings."—(P. 101, 102.)

Mr. Joyce adds a proper protest against judicial *cram*:—

"No opinion of any value can be formed by running to text-books, or turning out a word in an index, and referring to isolated passages bearing on the matter. Some of our most renowned text-books mislead most grossly, and a cursory application to a new subject does not qualify any one for forming a correct judgment."—(P. 103.)

The moment, however, that it is proposed to refer a doctrinal point to any portion of the spirituality, the cry is raised that the Royal Supremacy is in danger. Strange that the Royal Supremacy should be endangered by the very course on which it was expressly based in the Statute of Henry VIII! Strange that the Crown should be supreme when advised by lawyers, and not supreme when advised by divines! Here, however, the lawyers are supported by the whole force of Whig statecraft. The Whigs, in spite of their Protestant pretences, have no conception of any priesthood but a Popish one. It is nothing that the clergy are under the Crown—restrained by law—patriotic in their sentiments—pledged more than any other persons whatsoever to sustain the Royal Supremacy. For a Churchman "to do the work that is proper to him," (to use the language of the Restoration,) is in the eyes of a Whig to subordinate the State to the Church. Clerical disfranchisement and State oppression are their only expedients for upholding the union.

Another fallacy is the cuckoo cry that the Court is one of construction, not of legislation; it cannot alter the standards of the Church, but only explains them. But if construction is harmless in the hands of the lawyers, who do not understand the documents, why should it be dangerous in the spirituality, who do? Of the two, is it not obvious there must be more peril of altering the law by an unskilful exponent than by a skilful one? The truth is, as Bishop Blomfield unanswerably remarked, that the decisions of Courts of Final Appeal establish "precedents, and precedents settle or modify the law, and at last become

law themselves." To define the doctrines of the Church in the last resort is the highest exercise of the pastoral office. When Lord Brougham decides what a clergyman may or may not preach, he preaches himself far more potently than if he mounted a tub in Hyde Park. In the one case he would only exhort a single congregation: in the other he prescribes to all the pulpits of the National Church. Lord Derby disposed of this fallacy when, in answer to Lord Lansdowne's platitudes, he said that—

"He should much regret if either the one tribunal or the other had the power of establishing new articles of faith; but if he were to choose which of the two should have the power to bind the Church, of which he was a humble and unworthy member, he would not hesitate to take the power from a body who might not be members of the Church, and confer it upon those who were authoritatively set forth as the spiritual guides and instructors of the Church."—(P. 206.)

In these few honest words the Chancellor of Oxford University (to whom Mr. Joyce is permitted to dedicate his work) has exhausted the question. Mr. Joyce offers a number of suggestions for giving practical effect to them; but the only one that really answers to his array of precedents and arguments is the old constitutional Court of Convocation. Bishop Blomfield's Bill of 1850 proposed to refer questions of doctrine to the Bench of Bishops; but he was immediately reminded that in England other orders have a voice in defining the doctrine of the Church. The Upper House of Convocation, referred to in the 24 Hen. VIII, contained more abbots and priors than bishops; and in the present day the Lower House enjoys a concurrent jurisdiction with the Upper on questions of heresy.

Mr. Joyce would very much clear the way for Convocation, in this and other points, if he could establish his position (p. 195), that the Canon of Windsor, A.D. 1702, enjoining the Archbishop of York to obey the Archbishop of Canterbury's summons to Council is still in force, and included in the Statute 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19. That Canon, however, was shortly after overruled by the bull of Pope Honorius (*Wilk. i.* 407), as contrary to the institutions of Gregory I. and, we may add, to the metropolitical authority established by the Council of Nice. All subsequent National Synods in this country were convened under the Pope's legate, as the common superior of both archbishops; and when Edward II. tried to bring the two provinces together by royal authority, and the archbishops obeyed, the clergy twice protested that they could not be cited out of their own province, and the metropolitans were obliged to return within their respective jurisdictions (*Wilk. Conc. ii.* 442, 547.)

This, however, is comparatively of little moment, since, after the tampering which the Constitution has undergone by legislative enactments, a new Act of Parliament would be requisite to restore the appellate jurisdiction, and in that case provision would doubtless be made for the union of the provinces. Mr. Joyce does not propose to displace the Judicial Committee; all that is needed is to withdraw the inefficient and delusive episcopal element, and provide a proper tribunal to which the Judicial Committee may refer points of doctrine. For this purpose, the two Convocations may elect a standing Committee of Appeals: Mr. Joyce suggests the two Archbishops, two Bishops of the province of Canterbury and one of York, with four Presbyters of the southern and two of the northern province. The Crown might appoint a Judge as Assessor without a vote, like the Lord Keeper in the House of Lords; and to this tribunal the Judicial Committee might refer specified questions to be certified of the Church's doctrine, much as an equity judge sends a case to be tried in a court of law. The answer to these questions would be the verdict of the spirituality, and the judgment upon that answer would be the act of the Crown, advised by the Judicial Committee, as at present. Thus all parties would perform their proper functions, according to the Constitution in Church and State. Mr. Joyce has done a good service in stating the case so intelligently. May we not hope that with two new archbishops uncommitted by personal complicity in the present disgraceful state of things this urgent Reform may be initiated next Session?

Venetian Diplomacy.*



HE wonderful city of Venice, whose influence upon the world is among the miracles of history, owed much of that influence to pure intellectual force. M. Baschet has just issued the first volume of a work which shows how its diplomatic intellect was cultivated. Between such a diplomatist as Michieli, and such a diplomatist as Lord Cowley, the difference is as great as between Titian and a mediocre academician. The ambassador of Venice was not a mere lay figure; his duty was to study mankind, and to tabulate the results of his study; the Venetian Senate required from him, when he returned to the civic republic, an elaborate *relazione* concerning the persons with whom he had held intercourse. These *relazioni* are among the richest historic treasures hitherto uninvestigated: M. Baschet has been rewarded for his labours in this direction by remarkable revelations in reference to Spain, France, England, and Rome.

England naturally attracts the English reader. The Venetian sketches for us Henry VIII. in his youth, the handsomest prince in Europe, courteous and generous—and Wolsey the magnificent, more potent than if he were Pope, laborious, learned, and superb. Mary is admirably depicted in her crowned misery, married to a man as stern and inexorable as herself, hating her sister for her religion, and because she was certain to succeed her, haunted by strange superstitions and the victim of strange diseases. Of Elizabeth we catch but a passing glimpse, for Venice during her reign appears to have terminated its diplomatic relations with England. But the picture of Mary and her husband is very remarkable. A great historical essayist might find a noble subject in Philip II. of Spain and his wives. That fierce, and stern, and indefatigable brain deserves careful study. M. Baschet illustrates his work with autographs: among them we find a despatch from Antonio Perez, annotated by King Philip. It is wonderful to look at. "*Voyez,*" says our author, "*cette écriture fiévreuse, presque indéchiffrable, à force d'être rapide! Sont-ce des chiffres ou des caractères, sont-ce des signes convenus ou des lettres alphabétiques?*" Tens of thousands of such despatches so annotated exist; and the king, in his gloomy solitude of the Escorial, not only wrote himself perpetually, but made his darling daughter, the Infanta Isabella, his secretary.

M. Baschet's documents in reference to Rome, extends from the Papacy of Alexander VI. to that of Clement VIII. Alexander VI. (Roderigo Borgia) was the Pope on whose daughter Pasquin bestowed the famous epitaph—

"Conditur hoc tumulo Lucretia nomine, sed re
Thais, Pontificis filia, sponsa, nurus."

Maria Sanuto wrote a thrilling account of the murder of Lucretia Borgia's third husband by her brother Cæsar, in 1500. "Thrilling" is not a favourite epithet of ours, but the Venetian ambassador's narrative deserves it by reason of its straightforward simplicity. The cool way in which he talks of Cæsar Borgia's killing "four or five noblemen or bishops every night" is almost amusing. This man had a genius for murder; he was the Napoleon of assassins. As to Pope Alexander himself, the ambassador describes him, at the age of seventy, as getting younger every day. "His cares and annoyances last but a single night; he has no ambition save the aggrandisement of his children. *Nè d'altro ha cura.*"

Pius III. ruled for twenty-six days only. Julius II. was a soldier-pope. Of him Pasquin wrote—

"Obtulerat, Juli, tibi quæ sors Julia claves:
Clavas, erravit, credo, datura fuit."

"This pope," said the Venetian ambassador, "would like to be lord and master of the world's game." When

* *La Diplomatie Vénétienne*, par Armand Baschet. Paris: Henri Plon.

Michael Angelo was finishing his statue, he asked the pope whether he would have a book in his hand. "No," replied Julius, "give me a sword; I am not a theologian." Leo de' Medici came next—most magnificent of the princes of the Church; whose magnificence, however, did not satisfy all his contemporaries, if we trust to Pasquin's evidence:—

"Raptorem si quis forsan mirare Leonem
Ignoras uncis unguibus esse feram."

Adrian VI. and his four successors do not require detailed notice, although Paul III. was unquestionably a ruler of no ordinary class: but to Paul IV. belongs the terrible renown of having restored the Inquisition. To him Pasquin has consecrated one of his fiercest epigrams:—

"Hic Carapha jacet superis invisus et imis:
Styx animam, tellus putre cadaver habet.
Invidit pacem terris, et vota precesque.
Impius et clerum perdidit et populum.
Hostibus infensus supplex, infidus amicis.
Scire cupis paucis cætera? Papa fuit."

Venetian diplomacy paints Sixtus V. in his true colours—a great man and a great pontiff, although he arose from absolute obscurity. The wit of Rome could find nothing worse than his obscure birth and low connections wherewith to taunt him. The statue of Pasquin was one morning arrayed in a dirty shirt, and Marferio was made to ask the reason. "My laundress has become a princess," answered Pasquin: the allusion being to the Pope's sister, who had gained an honest livelihood by washing linen. Pope Sixtus offered 10,000 crowns for the author of this pasquinade, and its writer betrayed himself. The Pope gave him the money, and ordered his right hand to be cut off.

Of course M. Armand Baschet devotes a large part of his volume to Venetian revelations concerning France. The most interesting portion of the book relates to Catherine de' Medici and the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew. We have a sketch of her in her youth, when Ariosto referred to the uncertainty of her future life:—

"One branch, with little foliage, still is green:
'Twixt hope and fear I tremble, for I know not
Whether the winter days will kill or spare me."

Catherine de' Medici was the *Duchessina*, then—the "little Duchess," *la fanciulla*. Everybody petted her, as one might pet a baby tigress, for the beauty and the grace of the creature—without thinking of the possible cruelty lurking in those dark dangerous eyes. She was *petite*, the *fanciulla*—with much vivacity and charming wit—with the great Medici eyes. Hers was a strange career. She was married ten years before a child was born to her, and the birth of her first child was simultaneous with her husband's estrangement from her, and passion for Diana of Poitiers. She "played a waiting game." She sat calm while to the fair Diana minstrels sang in her presence rhymes such as these:—

"Que voulez-vous, Diane bonne,
Que vous donne?
Vous n'eustes, comme j'entends,
Jamais tant d'heur au printemps
Qu'en automne?"

Quietly she waited, knowing well that the reign of the fair Diana could not last for ever. Lorenzo Contarini, the Venetian ambassador of that epoch, fathomed her capacity, and wrote thus: "no doubt she would be apt to govern." So indeed she proved herself, when the days of her triumph came; when, with sons who were kings of France, she was the real monarch of France.

The Venetian view of the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew is rather original. Catherine, if those diplomatists judged rightly, cared nothing for religion—cared only for herself and her family and the regal power. And Coligny, her chief enemy, was, in the astute eyes that watched him from Venice, as crafty an intriguer as herself. Charles IX. was wild for war; he desired excitement, rapid action: Coligny, seeing this, imagined that he might efface Catherine's influence if once he could induce the king to declare war with Spain. Hence Catherine, eager to maintain her power, looked with jealous dismay upon the admiral's influence, and made religion the pretext for getting

rid of him. There is said moreover (but here M. Baschet is doubtful) to be a letter in existence, in the hands of M. Crétineau-Joly, which indicates that the admiral himself had projected a massacre of the Roman Catholics! This letter will soon be published, when we may judge for ourselves of its real import.

The history of Catherine de' Medici is very curious. How came the *Duchessina*, the *fanciulla*, to develop into the tigress? How could the woman, who was so fierce and resolute in the after-time, tolerate the sway of Diana of Poitiers? It is an enigma. We quote, by way of conclusion, a passage from a letter to her daughter, Queen of Spain, just after her husband's death—curious both for its spelling and its sentiment:—

"Et Dyeu me l'a haulté (le Roi) et ne se contente de sela, m'a haulté vostre frere que je aymé come vous savés, et m'a lassyé avecque troys enfans petys en heun reyaume tout dyvysé, n'y ayant heun seul à qui je me puisse du tout fyer qui n'aye quelque passion particuliyère."

There is a tenderness in this strange passage which seems to show that the tigress of the Medici loved her whelps.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Church and State Review,

EDITED BY

ARCHDEACON DENISON.

Published Monthly, Price 1s., per Post, 1s. 2d.

The CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW may be obtained at all the Railway Book-stalls, and of all Booksellers in Town and Country.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.

A Page	£9 0 0
A Column	4 10 0
Five Lines	0 5 0
Every additional Line	0 1 0

Advertisements must reach the Office not later than the 24th of each Month.

OFFICE: 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

The Title and Index to Volume I. will be given with the January Number.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE,

FOR DECEMBER 1862. No. DLXVI. PRICE 2s. 6d.

CONTENTS.

VICTOR HUGO ON THE GREAT FRENCH PUZZLE.

CANTONIAN.—PART XI.

No. 17.—Faith and Charity; or, the Union, in Practical Life, of Sincerity and Conciliation.

No. 18.—Upon the Efficacy of Praise

ALL IN THE WRONG; OR, THE TAMER TAMED.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.

CHRONICLES OF CARLINGFORD: SALEM CHAPEL. PART XI.

THE ENGINE-DRIVER TO HIS ENGINE.

THE COACHMAN OF THE "SKYLARK."

GIANNONE.

JOHN WILSON.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS,
Edinburgh and London.

THE CHELTENHAM SCHOOL.—Founded 1578; remodelled 1851. The Public School System based on Church Teaching; premises and play-grounds airy and ample; boys prepared for the Universities and all the Services. Distinguished Successes have lately been gained. Terms, 40s. to 60s. Reduction in favour of sons of clergy.

11 & 12, ALBION PLACE, LONDON

ROAD, READING. MISS HARRIS and Miss SATCHELL having prepared themselves for the work of instruction under eminent masters, both at home and abroad, will receive a few Young Ladies after Christmas, to whose education they will give unremitting attention. References to Clergymen and others. Prospectuses, &c. forwarded on application.

ROYAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

HEAD OFFICES,

29, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON, AND ROYAL INSURANCE BUILDINGS, LIVERPOOL.

The following is an Epitome of the Leading Results shown at the Annual Meeting of Shareholders, on the 8th inst.:—

FIRE BRANCH.

Large as the revenue under this branch had become in preceding years, the year 1861 has produced a further increase of fire revenue, the premiums having attained the sum of 292,402l., being an increase in a single year of 29,425l.

The fire revenue has more than doubled in the last six years, the total increase being upwards of 160,000l., an advance by natural expansion, which is probably without parallel.

The government returns of duty place the Royal, as respects increase of business, at the head of the offices.

LIFE BRANCH.

The prominent feature is the increase and great amount of the new business transacted by this Company, the sum assured under new policies alone for the past year amounting to 521,101l.; exceeding, by 70,000l., the new insurances of the preceding year, which again had shown a great advance on its predecessors.

This large amount of business (and upon which the current year shows a yet further advance), is believed to result from public confidence, and from the signal advantage the life branch possesses in being so lightly burdened, the fire branch, from its magnitude, bearing by far the larger share of the general expenses of management, an advantage few companies possess to the like extent.

The total paid-up Capital and Accumulated Funds of the Company were certified by the Auditors to amount to 846,000l.

PERCY M. DOVE, Manager.

JOHN B. JOHNSTONE, Secretary.

October, 1862.

Church-Rates.

THE COMMITTEE of LAYMEN, while

they congratulate Churchmen on the renewed rejection of the Abolition Bill, frankly and earnestly call upon all friends of the Constitution to support them with the pecuniary means requisite to ensure similar success for the future. The Committee have hitherto not received a tenth of the annual revenue placed at the disposal of those whose projects they have had to watch and counteract.

It is requested that contributions may be addressed expressly to "The Committee of Laymen," at the banks of Messrs. Hoare, 37, Fleet Street; and Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birch Lane, London; or to the Honorary Secretary, 16, Manchester Buildings, Westminster, S.W.

JOHN M. KNOTT, Hon. Sec.

June 30, 1862.

THE LONDON ANTI-PEW

SOCIETY. 12, Bucklersbury, London, E. C.

H. B. FARINGTON, Hon. Sec.

WEST MIDLAND and WEST of ENG-

LAND CLERICAL REGISTRIES.—Conducted by a Clergyman. Offices, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire; Established April, 1862; comprising 200 Members. LIVINGS for SALE:—Wiltshire, Next Presentation, 300l. a-year, immediate possession. Derbyshire, Next Presentation, 500l. a-year, early possession; Incumbent's age eighty-eight. Dorsetshire, Next Presentation, and Advowson subsequently, 180l. a-year; Curacy, and Interest allowed; Incumbent's age seventy. Oxfordshire, Presentation or Advowson, 200l. a-year, very early possession. Suffolk, Advowson, 250l. and house; immediate possession. Patrons having Livings for Sale, with immediate or deferred possession, will hear of Purchasers among the Society's members. EXCHANGES, seventy or eighty; Incomes from 100l. to 1900l. Curacies supplied with Curacies, Holy Order Candidates with Titles. Prospectus on receipt of stamped envelope. Note.—"Members' Entrance Fee" will be found marked in Prospectus; and in order that no undue publicity be given to the "Affairs of the Society, as the private property of members," as a guard,—The Promoters' "rule," that the Entrance Fee shall be paid before the slightest information is afforded; a celebrated Ecclesiastical Law Writer acts as Legal Adviser, and conducts all the business part of the Association. Address Rev. Secretary, as above.

SUNDAY DUTY at reduced charges taken by

a CLERGYMAN, at shortest notice; charges, 1s. 1s. per Sunday, and travelling expenses. References. Advertiser will be free for Duty after the 21st of December. Address, Reverend D. (care of Reverend the Secretary), W. M. Clerical Registry, 1, Gloster Terrace, Malvern Link, Worcestershire.

HAILEYBURY COLLEGE.—*Head Master* —The Rev. ARTHUR GRAY BUTLER, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

Terms of Admission.

Pupils not nominated to pay—

Sons of Laymen, 6*5*l. per annum.

Sons of Clergymen, 5*5*l.

Pupils nominated to pay 10*l*. less in each case.

Donors of 100*l*. entitled to have always one pupil in the School.

Donors of 26*l*. 5*s*. entitled to nominate one pupil.

The holidays will be at the same times of the year as at Eton and Harrow. The School will be opened on Thursday the 11th of September next.

All communications are to be addressed to the

Rev. LEWIS DEEDS, Bramfield Rectory, Hertford, } *Hon. Secs.*

E. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Amwell, Ware, }

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE, RADLEY.

Visitor—The Lord Bishop of Oxford.

TRUSTEES.

His Grace the Duke of Marlborough.

The Hon G. C. Talbot.

Lieut.-Col. Robert Moorsom.

Robert Phillimore, Esq., D.C.L.

The Lord Richard Cavendish.

The Warden of All Souls', Oxford.

J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M.P.

Warden—Rev. Richard Whitmore Norman, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

Sub-Warden—Rev. William Wood, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

FELLOWS.

W. Haskoll, Captain, R.N., Bursar.

Rev. R. S. Wilson, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose Coll., Oxford.

Rev. E. N. Reynolds, A.M., Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.

Rev. A. L. Hussey, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.

C. A. Houghton, B.A., Exeter Coll., Oxford.

R. F. Clarke, B.A., Fellow of St. John's Coll., Oxford.

W. W. Jackson, B.A., Balliol Coll., Oxford.

R. Laing, Esq., Wadham Coll., Oxford.

George Wharton, B.A., Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

ASSISTANT TUTORS.

Rev. W. G. Longden, M.A., Fellow of Queen's Coll., Cambridge.

Rev. R. Gibbings, A.M., Trinity Coll., Dublin.

Lecturer in History—Sidney Owen, M.A., Ch. Ch., Oxford.

Director of French—M. Jules Buë.

Drawing (Military Drawing and Water Colours)—W. H. F. Hutchisson, Esq.

Gymnasium—A. Maclaren, Esq.

The College reopened on the 12th Sept., 1862.

The Scholarship of 30*l*., founded by Sir Walter James, Bart., for annual competition by candidates under eighteen years of age; and the Scholarship of 20*l*., founded by William Gibbs, Esq., for candidates under fifteen years of age, will be competed for at Michaelmas next.

For particulars apply to George Price, Esq., St. Peter's College, Radley, Abingdon.

St. Mary's College, Bampton, Oxon.

UNDER the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Instituted January, 1859, for the purpose of affording a "Public School" Education on Church principles to those of limited means.

The sons of the Clergy, Officers in Her Majesty's Service, and Professional Gentlemen only are received.

The course of Instruction includes Theology, the Classics (with special regard to Prose and Verse Composition), Mathematics, French, German, English, Drawing, Vocal Music, and Drilling.

Fee for Board, Tuition in all Subjects, Washing and Stationery, 9*l*. per quarter, in advance. Printed particulars on receipt of two stamps.

G. H. DREWE, Warden and Head Master.

Private Tuition.

THE REV. G. H. PARMINTER, B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of S. John and S. George, Exeter—PRIVATE TUTOR for the Examinations for the UNIVERSITIES, ARMY, and NAVY, takes SIX Pupils.

During a long series of years Mr. Parminter's Pupils have taken *high or good* places, and one in the present year PASSED FIRST in the Examination for DIRECT COMMISSIONS.

Wynard House, Magdalen Hill, Exeter.

S. Andrew's College, Chardstock, Dorset.

A PREPARATORY SCHOOL for the Sons of the Clergy and Laity of small means.

Principal—The Rev. Charles Woodcock, M.A., late Student of Christ Church, and Vicar of the Parish.

Head Master—The Rev. Francis Allen, B.A., Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by a competent staff of Masters.

Terms:—Entrance fee Two Guineas; board, washing, and education, Ten Guineas a quarter, paid in advance. This charge covers all expenses. Full particulars forwarded on application to the Principal.

THE Rev. D. BINNEY prepares Boys for the Winchester College Elections, or other Public Schools. Terms and References on application. Address, The Elms, Shirley, near Southampton.

ST. MARGARET'S COLLEGE, NORTH- END, London, S. W. (near the Kensington Station), for the Education of Young Ladies.

Principal—Rev. ALEXANDER LENDRUM, M.A.

Lady-Superintendent—Mrs. LENDRUM.

The education and discipline are conducted, under the direction and superintendence of the principal, by talented and accomplished Governesses, English and Foreign, assisted by eminent London Professors.

The buildings consist of a spacious Mansion, with grounds of considerable extent, and large and lofty rooms. Twenty of the senior pupils have separate sleeping apartments.

The next term will commence, after the Midsummer holidays, on Tuesday, the 23rd of September.

N.B.—No day pupils are received.

Prospectuses and particulars sent on application.

SEASIDE Private Tuition. The Rev. T. J.

NUNNS, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, (First Class in Classics) receives pupils into his house to be prepared for the Universities, or for the Civil Service, or Military Examinations. Terms, according to age, 150 or 160 Guineas a-year. Seaford, Sussex.

TWO CAMBRIDGE MEN, Experienced

TUTORS, receive Twelve Pupils, and prepare them thoroughly and quickly for the Competitive Examinations, for open Scholarships at Cambridge, for the Indian Civil Service, and admission to the R. M. Academy, Woolwich. Terms Moderate. Apply for Prospectuses, &c. to M. A., 6, Angell Terrace, Brixton, S.

HOME MISSIONS. The Committee of the

Additional Curates Society earnestly appeal for funds to enable them to continue their Grants in support of 432 Curates; and to relieve some of the most urgent cases at present unaided. 163 unaided cases are on the Society's Books.

Rev. W. R. COSENS, M.A., Secretary,
7, Whitehall, London, S.W.

ST. PAUL, near PENZANCE.—Our Parish

Church was burned down by the Spaniards in 1579. The roofs of nave and aisles, the internal walls, and the irregular pews, are all sadly dilapidated; the population is 3,500, chiefly the "Mount-bay fishermen." We have preserved our church-rate to support public worship, and we have just succeeded in rebuilding our Church Town Schools, and opening them for boys and girls under certificated teachers. We have obtained a set of plans for reseating and restoring our Church from Messrs. Salter and Perrow, Architects, 7, Wood Street, Westminster; 315 additional sittings will be secured, and declared free and unappropriated for ever. Will Christian friends help us to procure the required fund of 1,000*l*.?

CONTRIBUTIONS, either in donations or four or five annual instalments, may be paid to the "St. Paul Church Fund," at the Bank of Messrs. Drummond, Charing Cross, London; and Messrs. T. S. Bolitho and Sons, Penzance.

"It pitieth us to see her in the dust."

JOHN GARRETT, Vicar of St. Paul.

WILLIAM HARVEY, Kerris,

WILLIAM ANGIN, Mousehole, } Church-wardens.

St. Paul, near Penzance, 28, October 1862.

TITHE AND RENT GUARANTEED

SOCIETY. Capital 100,000*l*. Established 1850. 3, Charlotte Row, Mansion House, London. Tithes collected, and payment of the whole amount due, guaranteed upon a fixed day. Rents and other Incomes collected and guaranteed. Terms very moderate.

INSTITUTION for the EDUCATION of the CHILDREN of AFRICAN CHIEFS and OTHERS at CAPETOWN.

ITS OBJECTS.—This Institution was founded by Sir G. Grey and the Bishop of Capetown, with a view to the Civilisation and Conversion of the native tribes of South and Central Africa. It was believed that such an Institution would—

(1) Help to render less probable those native wars which have cost England so vast an expenditure of blood and treasure.

(2) Promote the civilisation or tribes beyond British territory, by giving a plain English industrial and Christian education to the children of the leading people of those tribes.

(3) Provide a body of Native Teachers to aid in the spread of the Gospel in South and Central Africa.

ITS PLAN.—With a view to these objects an estate was purchased of about 150 acres in the immediate neighbourhood of Capetown, with buildings upon it, capable of providing accommodation for the Warden and his wife; a Female Missionary; Schoolmaster and wife; cabinet-maker and carpenter; shoemaker, tailor, agriculturist, and fifty boys and girls. Also a Chapel, Schoolroom, carpenter's shop, shoemaker's ditto, tailor's ditto; and Teachers have been provided for all these branches of instruction.

ITS PROGRESS.—The Institution has now been founded four years. All the children have made great improvement during that period in reading, writing, English history, geography, arithmetic, drawing, music, in Scripture knowledge, and in the Christian Faith. Many of the boys work sums in decimals with great rapidity and ease. The writing is exceedingly good. The whole of them sing well in parts, some having fine voices. Nearly all are well grounded in the Catechism and the leading Articles of the Christian Faith.

ITS RESULTS.—The Institution has not been long enough in existence to show what its fruits are likely to be. There can be no doubt, however, but that nearly all the children have silently undergone a great change. Their habits, manners, tone of mind, have gradually and greatly improved. One by one, without invitation, the greater number have expressed a desire to be baptized. Several have been confirmed, and are regular communicants. What their future life, conduct, occupation, will be, remains to be seen, and must depend greatly upon circumstances. Nearly all are anxious to come to England to complete their education. Some probably will become Schoolmasters;—others Catechists;—others, again, it is to be hoped, will be ordained. Four are now completing their education at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; being maintained there by the Archdeaconry of Hereford, and are doing very well. Others are prepared to go with a Clergyman from the diocese of Capetown to aid him in establishing a Mission-work in Independent Kaffraria; one has proceeded to take charge of a Kaffir School in the diocese of Capetown.

ITS PRESENT POSITION AND DIFFICULTIES.—The Institution has received hitherto a sum of 1,000*l.* a year out of the grant made by the British Parliament for the purpose of introducing civilization into Kaffraria. That grant was made for four years, and ceases within a few months. When it drops there will not be sufficient funds to maintain the Institution, unless they should be supplied by English Churchmen. It will then be possessed of two farms in Kaffraria, which at present produce nothing; several houses which are let for about 150*l.* a year; and 400*l.* a year from the S. P. G., which provides stipends for the Warden, Female Missionary, and Schoolmaster.

If fifty individuals, or parishes, would each adopt a child;—or if a few wealthy Churchmen would aid in its endowment, an Institution might be maintained which is calculated to have a considerable influence upon the future of South and Central Africa;—which seems to be essential to the success of any great work through native agency; and which it is hoped may with God's blessing provide what England is likely to be less and less able to supply, as the field of her operations becomes enlarged—a body of faithful teachers for Africa, drawn from the people of that country, educated at a small cost, and capable of being maintained at a small cost, to labour amongst their countrymen, under the leadership of English Clergymen. It would be a great pity were such an Institution, which has hitherto been conducted with marked success, and which is so full of promise, to be abandoned; but there is apparently no hope for it but in the liberality of English Churchmen.

Sir G. Grey and Dr. Livingstone have both repeatedly shown their deep interest in it, and their sense of its importance; and Bishop Mackenzie, in one of his last letters to the Bishop of Capetown, expressed a hope that he might be able to send speedily two lads from amongst the Manyanja to be educated within its walls.

Any contributions towards this object will be thankfully received by the "Bishop of Capetown, 20, Forester-terrace, Bayswater;" "Bishop of Capetown's Special Fund, Office of S. P. G., 79, Pall-mall;" or "London and Westminster Bank, St. James's-square, London;" and S. G. Harrison, Esq., 204, City-road, London, E.C.

The cost of maintaining each child is calculated at 16*l.* a year. It is hoped that in five years' time the lands of the Institution will at least help towards its support, and that the natives themselves may be induced to contribute something.

December, 1862.

R. CAPETOWN.

Cuddesdon Theological College.

THE NEXT TERM COMMENCES, (D.V.)

On SATURDAY, January 31, 1863.

An EXHIBITION of 50*l.*, tenable for one year by a Graduate of an University, will be VACANT at Christmas.

Candidates are requested to apply immediately to

The Rev. the PRINCIPAL, Cuddesdon College, Wheatley.

ST. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, Bradfield.—On January 29, 1863, there will be an *Election of Two Boys* under the age of fourteen, to the Foundation of this School, one of whom must be either fatherless or the son of a poor gentleman or clergyman. By the Statutes it is provided that—"The Founder's boys shall be lodged, boarded, and instructed gratuitously, and upon terms of equality in all respects with the Commoners." A printed form of application for admission as a Candidate may be had from the Secretary.

The Examination will begin on January 28, at 11 o'clock.

TO CLERGYMEN and CANDIDATES for HOLY ORDERS. The Rev. A. J. D. D'ORSEY, B.D., English Lecturer at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, receives Pupils in London at lectures, in classes, and privately every Monday and Tuesday, and in Cambridge the other week-days. Address, C. C. C. Cambridge, or 26, Chester Terrace, Regent's Park.

A FOREIGN PRIVATE TUTOR.—Agrége de l'Université de Paris, thoroughly acquainted with the German, English, French, Greek, Latin, and Sanscrit languages, and assisted by a first-rate Mathematician, late Professor of Natural Sciences at the Lycée Impérial Napoléon, prepares Eight Candidates for the Military, the Home and India Services, as well as the Universities. Apply to Professor Dr. B. 14, Rue Saint Thomas, Saint Germain en Laye, near Paris, France.

THE Rev. W. WEBSTER, M.A., late of King's College, London, and formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, receives PRIVATE PUPILS for the Universities or Competitive Examinations.—3, Park Villas West, Richmond, S.W.

CASSEL, France, (Nord).—Continental Home and Education.—An English Lady, of mature age, and of great experience in training the mind and forming the female character, with substantial references extending through many years—to a bishop, to nobility, and to benefited clergymen and gentry—RECEIVES under her especial care a few LADIES to BOARD and EDUCATE. A Parisian governess. Terms moderate, and open to family circumstances. Cassel is a first-class station on the Paris and Belgian line, and within easy distance of Dunkerque steam communication with London, Hull, and Liverpool. The locality is most healthy and beautiful, and a favourite resort of the continental tourist. Adult ladies, desirous of completing their education, may here receive individual attention and the comforts of an English home. Address, Madame H. H., Cassel, France (Nord).

CASSEL, France (Nord).—Sound Education.—An English Clergyman, residing in the beautiful and proverbially healthy neighbourhood of Cassel, RECEIVES a few PUPILS to prepare for the Army, Navy, and Civil Service Examinations, also for other professional pursuits of life. He has had great experience as a tutor, and offers all the comforts of an English home. Cassel is a first-class station on the Dunkerque, Lille, and Paris Railway, and is reached from Dunkerque in three-quarters of an hour. Steam communication with London, Hull, and Liverpool. Address, Rev. D. D., Cassel, France (Nord).

TO LADIES, domesticated and educated.—A Clergyman, Chaplain on the Continent, offers a superior Home to a Lady of position and of sound Christian principles, having a small capital. Address, Rev. D. D. (*affranchée 4d.*) Cassel (Nord), France.

THE Rev. E. J. LUCE, M.A. (late Head Master of the Amersham Grammar-school), receives into his house, which is large and commodious, and stands in a park of thirty acres, a select number of PUPILS, to prepare for the Civil Service Examinations, for Public Schools, or for the Universities. The Pupils have every privilege which a married Clergyman's home can afford, being treated in all respects as members of the family. Delicate, dull, or backward Pupils receive especial attention and care. Terms from sixty to eighty guineas per annum, according to age and requirements.—Boyl House, Amersham, Bucks.

ENGLISH CHURCH, BADEN BADEN.

English Churchmen are earnestly requested to AID in BUILDING a CHURCH at BADEN BADEN. The present Chaplain (the Rev. W. B. FLOWER) has endeavoured to set forth the true character of the English Church by means of daily prayer, weekly and Saints' Day Communion, &c. The Town of Baden will kindly give the site. The movement is supported in England by the Revs. T. T. Carter, J. Skinner, J. L. Galton, W. H. Westmore, W. E. Brendon, C. Wray, and G. Wakeling, &c. Subscriptions will be received in London by the Rev. W. R. Cosens, 7, Whitehall; Messrs. Masters and Co., 78, New Bond Street; in Baden Baden by Messrs. Müller and Co. to the account of the Rev. H. C. Hildyard, Treasurer, and also by the

Rev. J. F. RUSSELL, B.C.L., F.S.A., Hon. Sec.

S. Mary's Greenhithe, Kent.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—FIRST LIST.

Her Majesty the Queen of Prussia (1st don.)	400 <i>l.</i>	
Her Majesty the Queen of Prussia (2d don.)	200 <i>l.</i>	
Her Majesty the Queen of Prussia (3d don.)	200 <i>l.</i>	
A Friend, through H. M. the Queen of Prussia	£ 1.	
Countess Blucher and Miss D. Dallas	50 0	
The Duke of Hamilton & Brandon (1st don.)	25 0	
Mr. C. A. Bristed	25 0	
Captain Woodman	10 0	
Captain Langford	25 0	
Hon. W. Eden	10 0	
His Excellency G. R. Gordon, Esq.	10 0	
Mr. Mainwaring	20 0	
Mr. F. Hamilton	10 0	
Rev. J. L. Galton	10 0	
Miss Burdett Coutts	5 0	
Mr. Nugent	5 0	
Mr. Easton	5 0	
Mrs. Marston	5 0	
Mrs. Lawrence Bicknell	3 3	
A Resident	3 3	
Mr. Blacker	20 0	
Collected by Captain Woodman (in England)	10 0	
Rev. J. Penruddock	5 0	
Mrs. Winthrop M. Præd	4 0	
Lady Selina Bridgman	1 0	
J. Pitman, Esq.	5 0	
Mrs. Closs	1 0	
Mr. Gaus (Burgomaster)	2 0	
Mr. Waters	60	francs
Mr. Stockdale's Readings	241	
Mr. Tyrrell (Dublin)	60 0	
A Friend at the Holland	120	
Lady Dinorben	60	
A Member of the Greek Church	100	
Mrs. Osborne Bateman	40	
Captain Knox	100	
Rev. A. Gurney	20	
Mr. Appleton (Boston)	200	
A Visitor	80	
Lord Loughborough	20	
Lord Sudeley	20	
Hon. Admiral Knox (1st don.)	50	francs
Hon. J. E. Knox	50	
Hon. Admiral Knox (2d don.)	50	
Mr. Bradshaw	10	

A CIVIL ENGINEER has a Vacancy for an Article PUPIL, out of doors. Terms and particulars may be known by applying to "M. Inst. C. E." care of Mr. Roberts, 197, High Street, Broadgate, Exeter.

THE PERFECT SUBSTITUTTE for SILVER.—The REAL NICKEL SILVER, introduced more than twenty-five years ago by WILLIAM S. BURTON, when Plated by the patent process of Messrs. Elkington and Co., is beyond all comparison the very best articles next to sterling silver that can be employed as such, either usefully or ornamentally, as by no possible test can it be distinguished from real silver. A small useful set, guaranteed of first quality for finish and durability as follows:—

	Fiddle or Old Silver Pattern.	Thread or Brunswick Pattern.	Lilly Pattern.	King's or Military, &c.
12 Table Forks	£ 1 13 0	£ 2 4 0	£ 2 10 0	£ 2 15 0
12 Table Spoons	1 13 0	2 4 0	2 10 0	2 15 0
12 Dessert Forks	1 4 0	1 12 0	1 15 0	1 17 0
12 Dessert Spoons	1 4 0	1 12 0	1 15 0	1 17 0
12 Tea Spoons	0 16 0	1 2 0	1 5 0	1 7 0
6 Egg Spoons, gilt bowls	0 10 0	0 13 6	0 15 0	0 15 0
2 Sauce Ladles	0 6 0	0 8 0	0 9 0	0 9 0
1 Gravy Spoon	0 6 6	0 10 0	0 11 0	0 12 0
2 Salt Spoons, gilt bowls	0 3 4	0 4 6	0 5 0	0 5 0
1 Mustard Spoon, gilt bowl	0 1 8	0 2 3	0 2 6	0 2 0
1 Pair of Sugar Tongs	0 2 6	0 3 6	0 4 0	0 4 0
1 Pair of Fish Carvers	1 4 0	1 7 6	1 10 0	1 12 0
1 Butter Knife	0 2 6	0 5 6	0 6 0	0 7 0
1 Soup Ladle	0 10 0	0 17 0	0 17 0	1 0 0
1 Sugar Sifter	0 3 3	0 4 6	0 5 0	0 5 0
Total	9 19 9	13 10 3	14 19 6	16 4 0

Any article to be had singly at the same prices. An oak chest to contain the above, and a relative number of knives, &c., *2l. 15s.* Tea and Coffee Sets, Dish Covers, and Corner Dishes, Cruet and Liqueur Frames, &c., at proportionate prices. All kinds of re-plating done by the patent process.

CUTLERY warranted.—The Most Varied Assortment of TABLE CUTLERY in the World, all Warranted, is on Sale at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S at Prices that are remunerative only because of the largeness of the sales.

IVORY HANDLES.	Table Knives per Dozen.	Dessert Knives per Dozen.	Carvers per Pair.
3½-inch Ivory Handles	12 6	10 0	4 3
3½-inch Fine Ivory Handles	15 6	11 6	4 3
4-inch Ivory Balance Handles	18 0	14 0	4 6
4-inch Fine Ivory Handles	24 0	17 0	7 3
4-inch Finest African Ivory Handles	32 0	26 0	11 0
Ditto with Silver Ferules	40 0	33 0	12 6
Ditto, Carved Handles, Silver Ferules	50 0	43 0	17 6
Nickel Electro-Silver Handles, any pattern	25 0	19 0	7 6
Silver Handles, of any Pattern	84 0	54 0	21 0
BONE AND HORN HANDLES.—KNIVES AND FORKS PER DOZEN.			
White Bone Handles	11 0	8 6	2 6
Ditto Balance Handles	21 0	17 0	4 6
Black Horn Rimmed Shoulders	17 0	14 0	4 0
Ditto Very Strong Riveted Handles	13 0	9 0	3 0

The largest stock in existence of plated Dessert Knives and Forks, in cases and otherwise, and of the new plated Fish Carvers.

DISH COVERS and HOT-WATER DISHES, in every material, in great variety, and of the newest and most *richer* patterns, are on Show at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S. Tin Dish Covers, 7s. 6d. the set of six; block tin, 12s. 3d. to 35s. 6d. the set of six; elegant modern patterns, 39s. 9d. to 69s. the set; Britannia metal, with or without silver-plated handles, 3l. 11s. to 6l. 8s. the set of five; electro-plated, 9l. to 21l. the set of four. Block-tin Hot-Water Dishes, with wells for gravy, 12s. to 30s.; Britannia metal, 22s. to 77s.; electro-plated on nickel, full size, 9l.

WILLIAM S. BURTON'S GENERAL FURNISHING IRONMONGERY CATALOGUE may be had Gratis, and free by post. It contains upwards of 500 Illustrations of his illimitable Stock of Sterling Silver and Electro Plate, Nickel Silver, and Britannia Metal Goods, Dish Covers, Hot Water Dishes, Stoves, Fenders, Marble Chimney-pieces, Kitchen Ranges, Lamps, Gaseliers, Tea Trays, Urns, and Kettles, Clocks, Table Cutlery, Baths, Toilet Ware, Turnery, Iron and Brass Bedsteads, Bedding, Bed-room Cabinet Furniture, &c., with Lists of Prices, and Plans of the Twenty large Show Rooms, at 39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman's Mews.

HART AND SON: ECCLESIASTICAL and DOMESTIC METAL WORKERS, in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron; 53 to 58, Wych Street, Strand, London, W.C., and 20, Cockspur Street, Pall Mall, S.W.

Chalices, Patens, Ewers, Candlesticks, Flower-Vases, Gas-fittings, Door and Bell Furniture.

MEDALS:—London, 1851; Amsterdam, 1853; Paris, 1855; London, 1862, for great beauty and variety of design and perfection of workmanship.

Illustrated Catalogues, post free, on application.

To Clergymen, Churchwardens, and Architects (only).

GILBERT J. FRENCH, Bolton, Lancashire, sends post free, on application, an Illustrated CATALOGUE of his MANUFACTURES for use in the Church of England, including full particulars of Communion Linens, Altar Cloths, Carpets, Robes, Surplices, &c. &c.

Having no authorized Agents, all Orders are executed exclusively at Bolton, and delivered carriage free when the railway arrangements admit of pre-payment.

Direct communication by letter is respectfully invited as most convenient, satisfactory, and economical.

CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.

For all who Court the GAY and FESTIVE SCENES,

ROWLANDS' MACASSAR OIL,

An Improver and beautifier of the Hair beyond all precedent.

ROWLANDS' KALYDOR,

For imparting a radiant bloom to the Complexion, and a softness and delicacy to the Skin.

ROWLANDS' ODONTO,

Or, PEARL DENTRIFICE, for giving a Pearl-like Whiteness to the Teeth, and Fragrance to the Breath.

Sold by A. ROWLAND and SONS, 20, Hatton Garden, London, and by Chemists and Perfumers.

•• Ask for "ROWLANDS'" Articles!!

Established upwards of a Century.

JONES AND WILLIS, Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH FURNITURE, ROBES, SURPLICES, and CLERICAL CLOTHING, Temple Row House, Birmingham (Established upwards of a Century); and 72 and 73, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

Exhibition of all Nations, 1851.

"Church Carpets, Hangings, Episcopal Robes, &c."

The only AWARD for Church Decorations collectively.

International Exhibition, 1862.

"Church Furniture and Decoration, for Excellency of Workmanship."

The only PRIZE MEDAL for Church Furniture in general.

•• A CATALOGUE, containing near 400 Woodcuts and Estimates, free upon application.

JOHN HARDMAN AND CO.

Mediæval Metal Workers in Silver, Brass, and Wrought Iron.

Engravers of Memorial Brasses; Artists in Stained Glass; Stone Carvers, and general Church Furnishers and Decorators.

WORKS, NEWHALL HILL, BIRMINGHAM.

DUBLIN, 1, Upper Camden Street.

MANCHESTER, 94a, King Street.

LIVERPOOL Agents, HERBERT and Cox, Slater Street, Bold Street.

LONDON OFFICES and SHOW ROOMS, 13, KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND.

PRIZE AND COUNCIL MEDAL, 1851.

PRIZE MEDAL, PARIS, 1855.

TWO PRIZE MEDALS, 1862.

Designs and Illustrations on application.

HARLAND AND FISHER,

Ecclesiastical Decorators, &c.,

Manufacturers of every Description of Church and Domestic Mediæval Furniture, Paper-Hangings, &c. &c.

Designs and Estimates furnished, or an Illustrated Priced Catalogue sent upon application.

33, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND. W.C.

THE COMPRESSIBLE DRAUGHT and DUST EXCLUDER should be applied to the doors and windows of every building where, owing to imperfect fittings, cold and dust will penetrate. To be had from 2d. to 5d. per yard of the Patentee, RODOLPHE HELBRONNER, 265, Regent Street.

ROBES, SURPLICES, CLERICAL DRESS, CHURCH FURNITURE. An Illustrated Priced Catalogue, New Edition, containing nearly 200 Woodcuts, sent on receipt of 6 Stamps.

FRANK SMITH & Co., 13, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

CHURCH and DECORATIVE EMBROIDERY. FOR EVERY PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH. Executed from the best and most practicable Designs and Examples of ANCIENT NEEDLEWORK. Ante-pendia, Chancel-carpet, Sermon-cases, Book-markers, &c. &c., prepared with every facility for Ladies own working.

By R. HELBRONNER, 265, Regent Street, (near the Circus, Oxford Street).

Furniture Carriage Free.

CLERGYMEN about to furnish are most respectfully informed that RICHARD LOADER and Co. have just published and entirely new and elegant "Illustrated Furnishing Guide," comprising 216 well-executed designs of Cabinet and Upholstery Furniture, Iron Bedsteads, &c., which Guide they will be happy to forward, on application, to intending purchasers gratis and postage free. This valuable pamphlet also contains an estimate for completely furnishing a moderate sized parsonage-house, which, it is hoped, may be found of much service to those desiring such assistance. Every article warranted for twelve months, and exchanged if found defective. All orders are delivered carriage free to any part of the United Kingdom.

RICHARD LOADER and Co., Manufacturing Cabinet Makers, Carpet Warehousemen, and General House Furnishers, 23 and 24, Pavement, Finsbury, London, E.C.

GARDNER'S 2l. 2s. DINNER SERVICES complete, best quality. A large selection of patterns of the choicest description. Breakfast, Dessert, Tea, and Toilet Services, at the lowest possible prices. Cut Wines, 3s. 6d. per dozen; Cut Quart Decanters, 7s. 6d. per pair. H. and J. GARDNER (by appointment to her Majesty, the Board of Green Cloth, Lords of the Treasury, Admiralty, Office of Works, Customs, and the other Government Offices), 453, Strand, Charing Cross. Established 110 years. Engravings free by post.

CLERICAL TWEED CLOTHING.—

Made to measure at the following prices, for Cash only:—

The Complete Suit	52s.	63s.	and	85s.
Morning Coats	25s.	30s.	and	45s.
Trousers	16s. 6d.	21s.	and	26s. 6d.
Waistcoats	10s. 6d.	12s.	and	13s. 6d.
Frock and Overcoats	30s.	36s.	and	55s.

THRESHER AND GLENNY, Outfitters and Tailors, next door to Somerset House, Strand.

KNICKERBOCKER SUITS for 15s. 6d.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,
150, Regent Street.

BOYS' SCHOOL SUITS for 25s.

At B. JOSEPH'S AND COMPANY,
150, Regent Street.

For Churches, Chapels, and Schools.

KELLY'S ENGLISH MODEL HARMONiums, with 3, 7, 12, and 14 stops, in elegant Walnut and Rosewood Cases, the best and cheapest Instruments yet introduced. Also, 150 New and Second-hand Piano-forte, by Broadwood, Collard, and Erard, from 3l. The Trade and Merchants supplied.

11 and 10, Charles Street, Middlesex Hospital.

STRUVE'S SELTZER, FACHINGEN, VICHY, MARIENBAD, and other MINERAL WATERS.—ROYAL GERMAN SPA, Brighton. Under her Majesty's especial patronage. The Bottled Waters are sold at the Pump Room, Brighton, now open for the 38th season; and by GEORGE WAUGH & CO., Pharmaceutical Chemists to the Queen, 177, Regent Street, London, W., and other respectable houses in London and the provincial towns, where a prospectus, with the highest medical testimonials, may be obtained gratis.

CAUTION.—Owing to the use of Struve's bottles by other parties, please to observe that Struve's name is on the label and red ink stamp affixed to every bottle of Struve's manufacture.

HEDGES AND BUTLER beg to direct attention to their French and German Wines, comprising Chablis, Sauterne, Barsac, St. Peray, La Rose, Latour, Margaux, Lafitte, Chambertin, Côte Rôtie, St. George, Clos Vougeot, Hermitage, Nierstein, Hockheimer, Liebfraumilch, Rudesheimer, Johannisberger, Steinberger, Assmanshausen, Brauneberger, Muscatel Moselle, Sparkling Hock, Moselle, and Champagne.

Messrs. H. and B. respectfully recommend their SUPERIOR GOLDEN SHERRY, of soft and full flavour, at 36s. per dozen. PALE GOLDEN and BROWN SHERRY, 42s., 48s., 54s. FINE OLD PORT, 48s. to 72s. MADEIRA, BUCELLAS, TOKAY, and every other description of Wine.

* * Orders must be accompanied by a remittance or reference in London, on receipt of which any quantity will be immediately forwarded by HEDGES AND BUTLER, Wine Merchants, &c., 155, Regent Street, London, and 30, King's Road, Brighton. (Originally established A.D. 1667.)

N.B. Agents for, and Bottlers of, Bass & Co's. India Pale Ale.

Old Bottled Port 20,000 Dozen.

Laid down during the last 40 Years.

NOW BOTTLING, 100 PIPES—1858 VINTAGE.

Pasto Sherries, Moselles, Hocks, and Champagnes. 1st Growth Clarets, Burgundies, and very old Virgin Marsalas, &c.

Price List of all Wines Post Free.

GEORGE SMITH, 86, Great Tower Street, London, E. C.

"St. Martin" Malaga, very choice, for Sacramental use, 50s. Best Rota Tent, 42s. net. On receipt of P. O. Order.

PIESSE AND LUBIN'S HUNGARY

WATER. Cooling, refreshing, invigorating. "I am not surprised to learn," says Humboldt, "that Orators, Clergymen, Lecturers, Authors, and Poets, give it the preference, for it refreshes the memory." Emphatically THE Scent for warm weather. A case of 6 bottles, 10s.; single sample, 2s.

London: 2, New Bond Street, W.

JOHN GOSNELL AND Co.'s CHERRY TOOTH PASTE, gives the Teeth a pearl-like whiteness, and protects the enamel from decay.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Perfume—a most delicate perfume of exquisite fragrance.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Pomade—gives extraordinary Richness and Luxuriance to the Hair.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s La Noblesse Soap—surpasses all other Soaps in delicacy of Perfume, and for softening and whitening the Skin.

JOHN GOSNELL and Co.'s Ambrosial Shaving Cream—is a perfect luxury in shaving.

To be had of all respectable Perfumers and Chemists.

12, Three King Court, Lombard Street, London.

Teeth.

OSTEO-EIDON.—What is it? See Patent, March 1, 1862, No. 560. GABRIEL'S Self-adhesive Patent Indestructible MINERAL TEETH and FLEXIBLE GUMS, without palate, springs, or wires, and without operation. One set lasts a lifetime, and warranted for mastication or articulation, even when all others fail. Purest materials only, at half the usual cost.

Messrs. GABRIEL, the old-established Dentists, 27, Harley Street, Cavendish Square, and 34, Ludgate Hill, London; 134, Duke Street, Liverpool; and 65, New Street, Birmingham. International Exhibition, Class 17.

One visit only requisite.

Gabriel's "Practical Treatise on the Teeth," gratis.

Complete sets from four to seven guineas, and ten to fifteen guineas. Consultations free.

84,000l. in one or smaller sums, ready to advance at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 per cent. on Freehold Landed Property, also on Rent Charges, and good Personal Security, Principals only treated with. Apply, Mr. STEPHENS, Land and Estate Agent, 79, City Road, Finsbury Square.

ALLEN'S PORTMANTEAUS, Dressing Bags, Despatch Boxes, Ladies' Wardrobe Trunks, Writing and Dressing Cases, &c. Illustrated Catalogues of 500 articles for Continental travelling, post free.

Also, ALLEN'S BARRACK FURNITURE. Catalogue of Officers' Bedsteads, Drawers, Washhand Stands, Chairs, Canteens, and every requisite for the Camp or Field, post free.

J. W. ALLEN, Manufacturer, 31, West Strand, London, W. C.

Cramer, Beale, & Wood's PIANOFORTE GALLERY,

207 & 209, REGENT STREET.

CRAMER AND Co. have opened their spacious Gallery, Nos. 207 and 209, REGENT STREET, with a Selection of PIANOFORTES, which, for variety and excellence, is not surpassed, if equalled, by that of any similar Establishment in the United Kingdom.

Hitherto Purchasers in London have had no opportunity to compare, side by side, the Instruments of the chief houses, as each maker only exhibits his own. **CRAMER & Co.** now show under the same roof all the different kinds of Pianofortes manufactured by Broadwood, Collard, Erard, and other eminent Makers. In purchasing from **CRAMER & Co.** the public may rely on the quality of the Instruments being stated without reserve. Pianofortes of the very inferior class are carefully excluded from the Gallery. Among the superior class there are degrees of excellence, both as regards tone and external appearance, which vary with the prices. **CRAMER & Co.'s** Assistants will on all occasions carefully point out the special quality of each Instrument, enabling the Purchaser to form a correct judgment, and select a suitable Pianoforte.

If on any occasion an Instrument should fail to give entire satisfaction, it may be changed within six months from the date of purchase, if returned to **CRAMER & Co.** free of expense.

CRAMER, BEALE, AND WOOD'S NEW MODEL COTTAGE PIANOFORTE, price 35, 38, and 40 guineas. These Instruments, elegant in design, are carefully constructed with choice and well-seasoned material, by the most skilled workmen.

CRAMER AND CO'S. PIANETTE; a superior Pianoforte with check action, especially adapted for Small Rooms. Price 35 guineas.

PIANOFORTES EXPRESSLY CONSTRUCTED FOR EXTREME CLIMATES, packed in cases lined with zinc, and forwarded to all parts of the world.

HARMONIUMS.

DEBAIN'S HARMONIUMS received the Prize Medal and the very highest commendation. Their superiority has been incontestably maintained. M. Debain is the inventor of the Harmonium.

No.	1.	Polished oak case, one stop, four octaves	£	s.	d.
		Ditto five octaves	6	6	0
2.	"	three stops	12	12	0
3.	"	five stops	14	14	0
4.	"	seven stops	19	19	0
5.	"	nine stops	22	15	0
6.	"	eleven stops	28	15	0
7.	"	thirteen stops and knee action	36	15	0
8.	"	fifteen stops	43	0	0
9.	"	nineteen stops	59	0	0
		WITH PERCUSSION.			
10.	"	nine stops	20	10	0
11.	"	thirteen stops	39	0	0
12.	"	seventeen stops and knee action	60	0	0
13.	"	twenty-one stops	87	0	0

CRAMER, BEALE, and WOOD, Sole Agents.

EVERY MAN HIS OWN ORGANIST.—DEBAIN'S ANTIPHONEL, a substitute for an Organist or Harmonium player, by which any person without knowledge of music, can play hymn tunes, psalms, and chants. It is also adapted for the performance of overtures, quadrilles, waltzes, &c. It can easily be applied to or detached from any existing Organ or Harmonium, and is not liable to derangement. Price 12 guineas.

CRAMER, BEALE, AND WOOD, 207, Regent Street, London.—Wholesale Warehouse, 43, Watling Street.

Christmas Decorations.

PRICE LIST ON APPLICATION.

HARLAND AND FISHER,

33, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW.

Country Booksellers and Newsagents desirous of having the Contents Bill of the Church and State Review sent them regularly should immediately communicate with the Publishers.

Price 2s. 6d.

A READING COVER to contain the current Numbers of the Church and State Review. It will be large enough to hold six copies, and may be obtained to order of any Bookseller or Newsagent.

NOTICE. CHURCH AND STATE REVIEW.

Complaints having been made to the Publishers of difficulty in obtaining the Church and State Review, it is respectfully intimated that it can be obtained to order of any respectable Bookseller or Newsagent in the United Kingdoms, AND AT ALL THE RAILWAY BOOKSTALLS.

The Conservative Land Society.

THE ELEVENTH YEAR. Trustees—

VISCOUNT RANELAGH, and **J. C. COBBOLD, Esq., M.P.** This Society has now entered on its Eleventh Year, having been established on September 7th, 1852. Prospectuses, explanatory of the Share, Deposit, Land and Building Departments, will be sent, free of charge, to any part of the world. No Partnership Liability, and the taking of land entirely optional. Present rate of interest, payable in half-yearly warrants, 5 per cent. per annum on Shares (with participation in any profits above that allowance), and 4 per cent. per annum on Deposit Accounts, the Investors not becoming Members of the Society.

CHARLES LEWIS GRUNEISEN, Secretary.

Offices, 33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W. C.

Now ready, price 14s.

Twenty Years of Financial Policy.

BY **SIR STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, BART., M.P.**

London: **SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO.,**
66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

New Works by EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.

Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s., by post 1s. 2d.

THE PRESERVATION OF GENERAL HEALTH.

With some Remarks upon Healthy Skin, and Subjects of Medical interest to the Public generally, including Notes upon Homœopathy, Nursing, or Attendance upon the Sick, and the Medical Art.

BY **EDWIN PAYNE, M.D.**

Licentiate of the Royal College of Physicians, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, Assistant Physician to the Royal General Dispensary, Member of the Hunterian Society, &c. &c.

London: **HOULSTON AND WRIGHT**, Paternoster Row.

Also by the same Author, fcap. 8vo. 1s., by post, 1s. 2d.

SKIN DISEASES,

AND THEIR CURE BY DIATHETICAL TREATMENT.

ILLUSTRATED BY CASES.

London: **HENRY RENSHAW**, 356, Strand.

Seventh Edition, fcap. 2s. 6d. sewed; or 3s. cloth.

THE WATER-CURE in CHRONIC DIS-

EASE: an Exposition of the Causes, Progress, and Termination of various Chronic Diseases of the Digestive Organs, Lungs, Nerves, Limbs, and Skin; and of their Treatment by Water and other Hygienic Means. By **JAMES MANBY GULLY, M.D., L.R.C.S., and F.R.P.S. Edinburgh, and F.R.M.C.S. London, &c.**

"Dr. Gully has published a large and elaborate work on the Water Cure, which is, we think, the best treatise on the subject that has yet appeared."—*Westminster Review*.

"Dr. Gully's book is evidently written by a well-educated medical man. This work is by far the most scientific that we have seen on hydropathy."—*Athenæum*.

"Of all the expositions which have been published respecting the Water Cure, this is the most tangible and complete."—*Literary Gazette*.

London: **SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO.,**
Stationers' Hall Court.

SUPERIOR CHEAP BOOKS at BULL'S

LIBRARY.—Surplus Copies of Aids to Faith, Replies to Essays and Reviews, Montalembert's Monks of the West, Mrs. Delany's Life, Motley's Dutch Republic, Du Chaillu's Africa, and many other superior Books, are now on sale at *greatly reduced prices*. Catalogues gratis.

BULL'S LIBRARY, 19, Holles Street, Cavendish Square, W.

2d. IN THE 1s. DISCOUNT ALLOWED on BOOKS and MAGAZINES purchased at 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

PARCELS OF 5l. VALUE (at this rate) sent **CARRIAGE FREE** to any Railway Station in England.

CLERGYMEN, BOOK SOCIETIES, and LARGE BUYERS, supplied on more advantageous terms.

MAGAZINES supplied regularly on the 1st of the Month.

ANY BOOK sent Carriage Free on receipt of the Published Price.

A CATALOGUE of Books for Lending Libraries, sent for one Stamp.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

ELLIOT STOCK'S SERMON and MANU-

SCRIPT PAPERS, Ruled and Unruled, are sold in packets of 5 quires, at 1s. 3d., 1s. 6d., 2s., and 2s. 6d. each.

SAMPLES sent **POST FREE** on application.

PAPER RULED to ANY PATTERN on reasonable terms.

SERMON CASES with Two Pockets, 3s. each, post free.

PARCELS OF 20s. WORTH sent **CARRIAGE FREE** to any Railway Station in England.

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, London, E. C.

This day is published, price 6d., or by post for seven stamps :—

LANCASHIRE DISTRESS.—A Sermon, by T. GOODWIN HATCHARD, M.A., Oxon, Rural Dean, Rector of St. Nicholas, Guildford, and Domestic Chaplain to the Marquis of Conyngham.

London :—HATCHARD AND CO., 187, Piccadilly.

WORK FOR ADVENT.

Second Edition, fcap. cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THOUGHTS ON THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By the Rev. WILLIAM NIVEN, B.D., Incumbent of S. Saviour's, Chelsea.

"These 'Thoughts' express the matured judgment of a thoughtful student of Holy Scripture, and, as such, we cordially commend them to our readers."—*Christian Advocate*.

"This volume must be regarded as a valuable contribution to our stores of practical theology."—*Record*.

"This little volume contains as safe an exposition and treatment of the pre-millennarian system as we know; and its style is chaste, classic, and free from all tawdry ornament."—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

London : HATCHARD AND CO., 187, Piccadilly.

Next Week, price 6d., or by post for seven stamps,

THE WORKMEN: They are MEN.—A Sermon in behalf of the Lancashire Distress. By a Rural Dean.

HATCHARD AND CO., 187, Piccadilly, and all Booksellers.

GOOD NEWS FROM IRELAND.—An Account of a Recent Tour of inquiry into the CHURCH EXTENSION which has resulted from the labours of several Missionary Societies in WESTERN CONNAUGHT, will shortly be published in an Address to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England. By the Rev. JOHN GARRETT, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's near Penzance.

London :—HATCHARD AND CO., 187, Piccadilly, S.W.

Third Edition, price 1s., Words 1½d.

SEDDING'S NINE OLD CHRISTMAS CAROLS. Dedicated to the Rt. Hon. LORD JOHN MANNERS, M.P.

"Easy to sing, and most effective."—*Churchman's Companion*.

London :—NOVELLO AND CO.

MANUSCRIPT SERMONS.—250 MSS., purchased from the Widow of a deceased Popular Preacher; very legible. Specimens by post for thirteen stamps. THOMAS MILLARD, 70, Newgate-street, City. Libraries purchased. N.B.—Widows and Executors having any MSS. to dispose of will be liberally treated with.

THE PARISH MAGAZINE. Edited by J. ERSKINE CLARKE, M.A.

Contents of the December Number, being Vol. IV., No. 12 :—

New Carol, "Christmas is Here." By Rev. Archer Gurney. With Music.

The Beggar Boy on Christmas Eve (with Illustration).

Portuguese Brothers (with Illustration).

The Thorn (with Illustration).

The Journey of Life. Sermon by Rev. W. H. Ridley, M.A., Author of "A Tract on Confirmation," &c.

The Fourth Volume of the "Parish Magazine" will be ready to be sent out with the December Magazines. Price 2s. full cloth, 1s. 6d. limp.

Volumes I, II, III, always on Sale. Price 2s., and 1s. 6d. limp.

A Pamphlet of "Hints on Localising the Magazine" sent free to Clergymen or Church-booksellers on application to the Editor, St. Michael's Vicarage, Derby.

London : BELL AND DALDY, 186, Fleet Street, and by order of all Booksellers.

32 pp. Demy 8vo., THREEPENCE, FOURPENCE post free,

THE CHURCH of ENGLAND TEMPERANCE MAGAZINE;

CONTENTS OF NO. III., FOR NOVEMBER.

1. A Parent Sin.
2. The Great Physical Superstition of the Nation. By the Rev. G. T. Fox, M.A.
3. Who hath Woe? a Poem. By S. S. B.
4. Adulteration of Strong Drinks. A Paper by the Dean of Carlisle.
5. A Tabular Statement Showing the Proportion of Strong Drink used in Hospitals and Infirmarys.
6. Parochial Temperance Organization. (A Paper read at the National Temperance Conference, August, 1862.) By the Rev. Robert Maguire, M.A.
7. The Cry of the Builders; a Poem.
8. Who were his Tempters? Part III. By Mrs. C. L. Balfour.
9. With and Without; a Contrast.
10. Correspondence.—The Bishop of Durham and the Drinking of Toasts. By Presbyter Dunclemenis.—The Pledge. By the Rev. W. W. Robinson, M.A.
11. Monthly Letter (from our own Correspondent).

London : WEEKS AND CO., 44, Paternoster Row.

Messrs. Saunders, Otley, & Co.'s LIST OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

The LIFE, TIMES, and WRITINGS of the BISHOP of EXETER. By the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, of S. Mary Steps, Exeter, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." [Vol. I. Nearly Ready.]

The HISTORY of the CATHOLIC CHURCH from the Day of Pentecost to the Present Time. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, of Sackville College. 4 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The INFLUENCE of the CHURCH on the CIVILIZATION of the WORLD. A Contribution to the Evidences of Christianity. By WILLIAM LEE, Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. In 2 vols. 8vo. [In Preparation.]

The RELATION of CHURCH and STATE, and the Nature and Effect of an Established Religion. By Lord ROBERT MONTAGU, M.P. [In Preparation.]

The LATITUDINARIANS. A Chapter of Church History from the Accession of Archbishop Tillotson, in 1691, to the Death of Archdeacon Blackburne, in 1787. By EDWARD CHURTON, M.A., Archdeacon of Cleveland. [In Preparation.]

The CHURCHES of the EAST. By the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. [In Preparation.]

HISTORICAL MEMOIRS of the SUCCESSORS of SAINT PATRICK, and the BISHOPS and ARCHBISHOPS of ARMAGH. By JAMES HENRY THORN TODD, D.D., F.S.A.; President of the Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, and Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. [In the Press.]

ECCLESIA RESTITUTA. By F. C. MASSINGBERD, Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Ormsby. [In Preparation.]

SERMONS by the late Rev. C. T. ERSKINE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's Church, Wakefield, with a Memoir of his Life. Edited by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [In Preparation.]

The HELIOTROPIUM; or, Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine. Translated from the Latin of Jeremy Drexelius, by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of "The Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." With a Preface by the BISHOP of BRECHIN. [Nearly Ready.]

ESSAYS on LITURGY and CHURCH HISTORY. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D., of Sackville College. 8vo. [Nearly Ready.]

FAITH and PEACE. Being Answers to "Essays and Reviews" by Several Writers. With a Preface by the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON. 8vo. 12s. [Ready.]

ECCLESIA VINDICATA: a Treatise on Appeals in Matters Spiritual. With Suggestions for amending the Course of Proceeding in Appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. Dedicated (by permission) to the Earl of Derby, K.G. By JAMES WAYLAND JOYCE, M.A. 12mo. cloth, 5s. 6d. [Ready.]

The HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND from the Death of Elizabeth to the Present Time. By the Rev. G. G. PHRY, Rector of Waddington, and late Fellow and Tutor of Lincoln College, Oxford. In 3 vols. 8vo. Vol. II. 21s. [New Ready.]

RECOLLECTIONS of a COUNTRY CLERGYMAN. 8vo. cloth, 5s. [Ready.]

The AMERICAN CHURCH and the AMERICAN UNION. By HENRY CASWALL, D.D., Prebendary of Sarum. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Ready.]

BETTER DAYS. Edited by the Rev. REGINALD SHUTTE, Author of the "Life of the Rev. Henry Newland." 2 vols. 21s. [Ready.]

CHURCH RATE a NATIONAL TRUST. By the Venerable Archdeacon DENISON. 8vo. 5s. New Edition.

REMARKS on ESSAYS and REVIEWS. By Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., Governor of Madras. 11. 6d.

The CHARGE of the ARCHDEACON of TAUNTON, 1862. 4d.

London : 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square.

Just published, price 1s., by post 1s. 1d., the Third Edition (of 3,000) of—

BEN RHYDDING, the ASCLEPION of ENGLAND; its Beauties, its Ways, and its Water Cure.

By the Rev. R. W. WODROW THOMSON. Published by Messrs. T. NELSON and SONS, London and Edinburgh; and to be had by post, price 1s. 1d., of Mr. SHUTTLEWORTH, Bookseller, Ilkley, Otley.

THE LIFE OF THE BISHOP OF EXETER.

8vo. With Portrait.

Notice.

THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE

Life of the Bishop of Exeter,

BY THE REV. R. N. SHUTTE, OF EXETER,

Is now Ready.

All Orders for Copies of the First Edition should be given to Booksellers at once.

SAUNDERS, OTLEY, AND CO., 66, Brook Street, Hanover Square. W.

Just published. Price 12s.,

Essays in History and Art.

BY R. H. PATTERSON,

Author of "The New Revolution."

COLOUR IN NATURE AND ART.
REAL AND IDEAL BEAUTY.
SCULPTURE.
ETHNOLOGY OF EUROPE.
UTOPIAS.
OUR INDIAN EMPIRE.
THE NATIONAL LIFE OF CHINA.
AN IDEAL ART-CONGRESS.
BATTLE OF THE STYLES.
GENIUS AND LIBERTY.
YOUTH AND SUMMER.
RECORDS OF THE PAST : NINEVEH AND BABYLON.
INDIA : ITS CASTES AND CREEDS.
"CHRISTOPHER NORTH"—IN MEMORIAM.

Revue des Deux Mondes.

C'est un plaisir assez singulier que nous a procuré la lecture des *Essais* réunis de M. Patterson. . . . M. Patterson est sans doute un homme supérieur ; et il est loin de laisser faire ces instincts qui sont entrés en lui par droit de naissance—ces génies de son tempérament : toujours est-il qu'ils sont bien en lui. Quoiqu'il ait aussi son côté poétique, c'est un esprit essentiellement clair et logique, qui aime à spéculer, à embrasser de vastes ensembles, et qui procède volontiers par des séries consécutives de raisonnements, un esprit chez qui le besoin de comprendre, d'expliquer, et de résumer l'empêche d'une manière décidée sur le sentiment et sur les émotions capricieuses de l'imagination. . . . On ne s'étonne pas que ses articles sur la politique Napoléonienne (articles réimprimés depuis en volume sous le titre de *La Nouvelle Revolution*) lui aient valu la réputation de prophète et d'ingénieux penseur politique. S'il aime à généraliser, c'est en homme qui voit vraiment toutes les grandes données d'une question. . . . Dans ses instincts, comme dans son intelligence, il n'a rien d'exclusif. Cette disposition à rendre égale justice à tout le sert bien dans ses appréciations. . . . Une des qualités qui ont le plus contribué à sa supériorité c'est qu'il est viril. Il a le sentiment de la réalité, il ose la regarder en face : et cela n'est pas un mince avantage pour éviter toutes les extravagances qui aujourd'hui s'appuient sur tant de naïve sentimentalité.

Dublin University Magazine.

Not often, whether in prose or verse, does the same man command both "the vision, and the faculty, divine." Not often is the original thinker endowed with a fluent and fascinating style, which takes captive the crowd by its beauty. Mr. Patterson has this good fortune. He is an unquestionably original thinker, whom some readers might deem too daring ; and he has a noble and eloquent style, which also some might consider too ornate. He is a writer so full of novel and unusual thoughts that he throws them into notes, and encloses them in parentheses. His writing is pictorial, and very full of colour, yet it never lacks precision. . . . We have hitherto made reference only to Mr. Patterson's most thoughtful and philosophical essays. But the volume is diversified with "light reading." "Genius and Liberty" is a delightful essay, full of poetic ardour. "Youth and Summer" is nothing less than a prose poem—and that of no common kind. In "The Battle of the Styles" is condensed an immense amount of wit and wisdom. Mr. Ruskin's delightful fallacies are treated with admirable humour ; and the despot of art is as pleasantly bantered by his reviewer as was Robert Montgomery by Macaulay. . . . We can sincerely congratulate Mr. Patterson on having by this volume shown himself as original a thinker on subjects of general History and Art as he had previously proved himself to be on the contemporary history which we call Politics. He has insight, logic, humour, a noble and variable style—and can claim entrance by right to the first rank of authors of the day.

Athenæum.

In Mr. Patterson's *Essays* we have a volume which no discerning reader will open only once. Fine appreciative taste and original observation are found united with range of thought and rare command over the powers of the English language. . . . Our judgment leads us to prefer his Historic dissertations. And the treatise we should adduce before all the rest in support of the high opinion we entertain of the author's powers is that on "The National Life of China." For breadth and strength of handling, completeness of grasp, judicious arrangement of material, and lucid style, it is a model of what such a performance ought to be. . . . It is impossible to convey in a brief space any adequate impression of a collection of papers, written on a variety of subjects, and holding in every page proofs of unusual research and capacity. To form a fair opinion of Mr. Patterson's merits, readers must get his volume.

L'Indépendance Belge.

La lecture de ce livre atteste à chaque page que l'auteur traite de la peinture avec le pinceau d'Apelle, de la sculpture avec le ciseau de Phidias, de l'architecture avec le compas d'Ictinus. Il s'étale tour à tour des beautés et des effets de la nature, des artistes de l'antiquité, du moyen âge et de notre époque. Il critique avec autant de profondeur que de tact les plus grandes autorités contemporaines. Ses dissertations sont si simples, et cependant si animées, qu'en les lisant vous croyez voir l'azur du ciel, les paysages les plus luxuriants et les plus accidentés, la simple fleur des champs, l'onde argentée du ruisseau, l'infini de l'océan, les chefs-d'œuvre de l'art plastique et de l'architecture de l'ancienne Grèce et de l'ancienne Rome, de la Renaissance, et des temps contemporains. Ce magnifique panorama est parsemé de commentaires toujours originaux, de conclusions toujours logiques. La nouveauté des aperçus étonne tout d'abord le lecteur, qui se prend à accuser l'auteur de métaphysique ; mais bientôt il est forcé de revenir sur cette première impression devant la preuve mathématique. . . .

Il faudrait bien des colonnes pour apprécier ce livre de M. Patterson comme il le mérite, pour donner au lecteur une juste idée des critiques aussi originales que spirituelles qu'il contient. . . . Bref, le livre de M. Patterson—véritable mosaïque littéraire—a d'autant plus de mérite que nous sommes dans une époque où les publications de ce genre sont malheureusement trop rares. La critique doit recommander ce livre comme infiniment propre à former le goût et à aiguiser le jugement en matières d'histoire et d'art. Quant au style, il est toujours clair, mais toujours éloquent, toujours simple et toujours attrayant. Enfin, c'est un de ces ouvrages qu'on ne lit pas à moitié, mais jusqu'au bout, et qu'on retrouve toujours avec plaisir.

Macphail's Edinburgh Magazine.

All Mr. Patterson's writings are marked by a most striking originality in thought and in expression. . . . His present work is executed with great literary ability. The style is terse, vigorous, chaste, pictorial and lively. Thoughts, original and suggestive, startle us in almost every page ; and the matter is of the most solid kind. . . . The two elaborate *Essays* on India and China contain almost all that a general reader would wish to know in regard to these countries and their peoples. The facts can thoroughly be relied on—which is more than can be said of most works on Eastern Empires, especially the Chinese. . . . The "Castes and Creeds of India" is a most valuable essay, inasmuch as the information which it gives cannot be obtained elsewhere. To the missionary in India, and to candidates for the Civil Service, we would especially recommend it as well worthy of careful study.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS,
Edinburgh and London.

Now ready, strongly bound, 6s.

THE CHURCHMAN'S GUIDE TO FAITH AND PIETY. A Manual of Devotion and Instructions, compiled by R. B. and revised in part by the Rev. T. T. CARTER.

CONTENTS :—Treatise on Prayer—1. Summary of Faith and Duty.—2. Daily Rules, Morning Prayers ; Short Prayers for Every Hour ; Evening Devotions ; Itinerary ; Meditations ; Rules for Holy Life ; Prayers for each Day of Week ; Reflections for a Month ; Litanies.—3. Thanksgivings, Intercessions, and Prayers.—4. Holy Scripture ; Holy Days and Seasons.—5. Remedies against Sins ; Penitential Psalms, Self-Examination, Meditations and Prayers before Holy Communion, Thanksgivings after.—6. Preparation for Death ; Devotions for the Sick, &c.

London :—J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

Demy 8vo. 5s.

EIGHTEEN SERMONS OF S. LEO THE GREAT ON THE INCARNATION ; translated, with Notes, and the "Tome" of S. Leo in the original, by WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of University College, Oxford.

London :—J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

New Edition, now ready, 7s. 6d.

CONCINALIA. Outlines of Sermons for Parochial Use for every Sunday and Holyday throughout the year. By the Rev. HENRY THOMPSON, M.A., Vicar of Chard, Diocese of Bath and Wells. Second Edition revised and enlarged. Dedicated, by permission, to the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. Fcap. 8vo. cloth.

London :—J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

For Advent and the Church's Year. Pp. 480, price 6s.

SHORT READINGS ON THE COLLECTS.

By Sir ARCHIBALD EDMONSTONE, Bart.
"Admirably reflects the inner mind of the Church. A very delightful book. The faithful offering of one who desires to tread in the steps of Robert Nelson, and of whose spirit he has deeply drunk."—*Christian Remembrancer*.
"The great merit of the book lies in its candour, its fairness, and its well-balanced teaching."—*Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*.

A Catalogue of Advent Sermons, Works, &c. may be had on application.

London :—J. MASTERS, Aldersgate Street and New Bond Street.

Sermons for Advent. Recently published, Second Edition, price 2s.

DEATH, JUDGMENT, HELL, AND HEAVEN. Four Advent Sermons, by the Rev. F. G. LEE, of S. Mary's, Aberdeen.

"Warm and rousing, and good specimens of what such Sermons ought to be."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

"Four impressive Sermons suitable to the Advent season."—*Literary Churchman*.

"Thoroughly rousing ; reminding us in their minute and picture-like reality of the far-famed discourses of the celebrated Masillon."—*Clerical Journal*.

"Plain, but eloquent and forcible."—*Bucks Herald*.

London : MASTERS. Aberdeen : BROWN.

In the press, fcap. 8vo., by the same Author,

SERMONS ON FAITH AND PRACTICE.

DEAN ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

In 4 Vols., or 5 Parts, 8vo.

THE GREEK TESTAMENT ; with a Critically revised Text : a Digest of Various Readings : Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage : Prolegomena : and a copious Critical and Exegetical Commentary in English. For the use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.

VOL. I.—THE FOUR GOSPELS. A Fifth Edition is in the Press.

VOL. II.—ACTS TO II. CORINTHIANS. Fourth Edition. 24s.

VOL. III.—GALATIANS TO PHILEMON. Third Edition. 18s.

VOL. IV. Part I.—HEBREWS to II. PETER. Second Edition. 18s.

VOL. IV. Part II.—I. JOHN to REVELATION. Second Edition. 14s.

London : RIVINGTONS, Waterloo Place ; and
Cambridge : DEIGHTON, BELL, & CO.



